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Chapter 1: Setting Up the Dance

The Inspiration

The Presidential elections of 2016 and 2020 were a choice between the status quo and progression. The country hoping to find a consensus after two elections was unsuccessful. Donald Trump touted a vision of what America should be during his time as President and as a Presidential candidate that he believed aspects of American excellence have been lost due to progressive policy championed by President Barack Obama and defended by his 2016 general election opponent former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Donald Trump promised if elected to act differently than how career politicians have done in the past. Even after his defeat by Joe Biden, in 2020, he wasted no time to throw his political weight to keep control of the Republican Party. Usually, after a President's tenure in the White House, they tend to stay out of the spotlight and allow their successor to establish themselves with the American people and media. President Donald Trump, who has never followed political norms, did not follow this precedent.

In 2015, when Businessman Donald Trump first launched his presidential campaign, no one thought that he would go on to win the nomination, let alone the election and have such a tight grip on the Republican party voter base. The Trump campaign slogan, “Make America Great Again”, was able to tap into different demographics of the American electorate that felt unheard of or diminished during the Obama years (Sabato,2017). The election of Barack Obama was supposed to change many cultural norms in the United States, and more changes seemed likely to come if former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton had been elected President in 2016.
President Trump was able to form a new coalition in the Republican party that supported populist ideas such as anti-immigration policy, increased taxes on the wealthy, and promises to not cut social security (Rapoport & Stone, 2017, p.138; Forbes, 2020) that were opposite of what mainstream GOP values usually are. President Trump’s coalition within the Republican party was successful in 2016 and beyond. New coalitions within the GOP and unforeseen candidates arising in later elections, were not just limited to Republicans but occurred in the Democratic party with the rise of Bernie Sanders as a viable candidate for President in both 2016 and 2020. Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont was the Democrat’s version of Businessman Donald Trump both in 2016 and 2020. Even though Donald Trump was a reality star and a nationally recognized businessman, he and Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont were not seen as contenders for the nominations of their respective parties. Sanders energized parts of the electorate in the Democrat Party that were just as angry as their Republican counterparts and just the same as Trump appealed to many different demographics, Senator Berine Sanders did as well. The difference was in the Democratic party; the establishment candidate won the party’s nomination for President, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in 2016, and Vice-President Joe Biden in 2020. In the Republican Party's establishment, candidates such as Junior Senator Marco Rubio of Florida, Junior Senator Ted Cruz of Texas, and former Governor Jeb Bush of Florida lost to Businessman Donald Trump due to his unique style to debating and campaigning (Costa, 2017, p.108). Businessman Donald Trump often attacked his primary opponents using their record as career politicians and made fun of his political opponents to offend them which kept them off their guard that they could never find their political footing. Trump in the end looked like the best choice even if his answer were not the most thoughtful and well-conceived. All this begs the question: What made Businessman Trump’s campaigning approach effective,
and what sparked parts of the electorate to want this new direction for a President? The causes of such a dramatic shift in the electorate and the almost fanatic loyalty of the base of Businessman Donald Trump’s supporters, who were emboldened, can be argued was caused by the election of President Barack Obama in 2008 and his lack of inexperience in Washington D.C. and the weakness of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton as the Democratic Presidential nominee for the Presidency in 2016.

Businessman Donald Trump constantly ignoring long-standing taboos in politics seemed to resonate with a plurality of the electorate that allowed him to win, such as stating openly racist and sexist remarks (Neville-Shepard, 2021; Katz, 2016). Racist and sexist comments were present even at the start of his campaign. In his announcement in 2015 as a candidate for President, Businessman Donald Trump claimed Mexican illegal immigrants bring “rapists,” “drugs,” and “crime” (Trump, 2015) to the United States. Even towards the end of the General Election campaign and the release of the Access Hollywood tapes, when Trump talked about assaulting women did not make a dent in his poll numbers even among women (Neville-Shepard, 2021). Some would argue that it made Businessman Donald Trump a more authentic candidate and scored him political points with his base. Those who were excited about Businessman Donald Trump were not all your typical Republican voters. Businessman Trump flipped constituents that were traditional Democrats to win states such as Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania because they were disheartened by the Democratic party due to Obama Presidency and unenthusiastic of the nominee in 2016 former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

The rhetoric used by Businessman Donald Trump's messaging did not unify groups together under Trump’s vision of America but made the difference between the groups of voters
more pronounced (Johnson, 2017). Businessman Trump used demagogic messaging to highlight former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s undesirable qualities by explaining her hypothetical ascendance to the Presidency and portraying himself as hypermasculine to seem more Presidential. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and what she represented in the country were a big part of the 2016 Presidential race. Former Secretary of State Clinton was a woman, a career politician, and a person who, just like Businessman Donald Trump, was not perceived as likable by the electorate. Many of her supporters acknowledged that they were not excited about her campaign, and she lacked the charisma they looked for in a President (Wasike, 2019).

Former Secretary of State Clinton not only faced a more perceived charismatic opponent in 2016, but in 2008 as well in President Barack Obama. In those two contests, where former Secretary of State Clinton was in a two-person race nationally, the issues of sexism hurt her support overall, which led to her losing votes (Ratliff, Redford, Conway, & Smith, 2019).

Electing President Barack Obama as the first black President in 2008 was unprecedented. President Barack Obama’s team knew how to brand him and show off his charisma (Zavattaro, 2010; Ratliff, Redford, Conway & Smith, 2019). Once the campaign was over and governing began, President Obama had a political legacy to go off rather than an image he created. At the end of his second term, President Obama, who was still a relatively popular President, was looked at differently and viewed with more of a critical lens than during his original run for President. Obama, known for a calm persona that can be described as “grace under pressure” (Katz, 2016, p. 203), was arguably the total opposite of the man who would succeed him in the Presidency politically.
Why Is the Dance Important?

The reason this study is relevant to the academic community is to demonstrate that once progress is made in areas of the social or political sphere other parts of it suffered that is, the evolution of rhetoric does not follow a linear progression. President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in 2016 received a rebuke through the electoral college from Businessman Donald Trump and his supporters. Businessman Trump’s voters were looking for a return to traditional values as they defined them. They felt these values were being attacked under President Barack Obama and thought its assault would have continued under a Hillary Clinton’s administration. President Barack Obama’s coalition that put him in office in 2008 was deteriorating and a new social movement was formed. During the first two years of President Barack Obama’s administration saw the rise of the Tea Party and the Democratic Party’s loss of the House of Representatives in 2010 and the Senate in 2014. President Barack Obama’s occupation of the White House and the feeling of inevitability of a win by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in 2016 made the new coalition Businessman Donald Trump led in 2016 possible. President Barack Obama, being a black man, and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, being a woman, is not what a traditional President looks to the electorate. This study will lay the foundation for why arguments made by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and President Barack Obama were not successful in 2016 stopping Businessman Donald Trump; even though, he was plagued with many political controversies and the rise of the new conservative wave in America. Literature describing Businessman Trump's rhetoric that led to his rise to prominence and the perception what the American people believe a President should be are essential to lay the foundation for this study.
In this study three types of style of rhetoric used by rhetors will be examined in reference to how they present their message and themselves to voters. Masculine, hypermasculine, feminine, and hyperfeminine speech will be used to define rhetoric used by subjects to describe their appeal to the electorate. Masculine political rhetoric will use sports and military references (Blakenshop and Robson, 1995). This type of rhetoric will also be described as logical, impersonal, organized, and factual (Jamieson, 1990). Also, it will be characterized as rhetoric referring to taking charge of situations or of a protector. American society is historical a male dominated when it comes to politics, business or private domestic settings. Because of the that reason masculine political rhetoric in the context of any American sphere public or private would include qualities of leadership or a protector status. Masculinity has been antiquated with being a leader and as a leader an individual must protect their people and territory. Those will be explained more in depth when discussing Dr. Jackson Katz’s explanation on how the American Presidency is rhetorical “fought” (2016). Essentially, it is speech that is ruled by logic. Hypermasculine speech will in the context of this analysis will be rhetoric used against an opponent that uses masculine political rhetoric but also succeeds in dominating the political discourse with their ideas and shut down their opponent’s ability to make an alternative argument (Katz, 2016). Feminine political rhetoric will be defined in the context of the study is basing political judgement based on concrete experience and lived experience, valuing inclusivity and the relational of being, conceptualizing the power of public office as a capacity to “get thing done” and to empower others, approaching policy formation holistically, and moving women’s issues to the forefront of the public arena (Blakenshop and Robson, 1995). Finally, hyperfeminine
rhetoric will be everything that feminine rhetoric is but instead of using persuasion as a technique to win over support, the speaker will attempt to dominate the other and not let the others message be heard.

Dr. Jackson Katz, a respected academic, argued that Presidential elections are a constant to see what type of “alpha male” masculinity would be a standard for men and boys at a given time. Dr. Katz describes Presidential candidates using Hypermasculine to not be perceived as weak, and during the time of the race a way to show off to America their manhood. The American public’s perception of a candidate's masculinity can be the factor in losing or becoming a frontrunner in the race. Dr. Katz introduces an example of the need for the role hypermasculine dancers in a Presidential race was in 1980 between President Jimmy Carter and Governor of California Ronald Reagan. Dr. Katz describes this race as “Jimmy Carter[‘s] “soft” masculinity [and how it] had failed to inspire the nation at home and allegedly deepened [the] vulnerability to threats abroad, Ronald Reagan[‘s] “hard” masculinity would seek to take care of business on both fronts-literally and metaphorically” (Katz, 2017, p.79). During the 1980 Presidential race, President Jimmy Carter presided over a weak economy that turned into a recession. There was a hostage crisis in Iran, making President Jimmy Carter look weak. Governor of Florida Ronald Reagan’s background as an actor reminded the American public mind of the iconic actor John Wayne, and he “drew upon the largest myths of America’s past, especially the myth of the strong, stern, white male patriarch who could restore order to a world gone mad” (Katz, 2017, p.82).

During their respective times running for President, then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois, then- Junior Senator Hillary Clinton of New York, and Businessman Donald Trump each had their nuanced masculine personas. President Barack Obama is a black man who could
not rely on traditional displays of American masculinity because the Presidency was historically a white office. Dr. Katz writes that President Obama “was able to convey strength and masculine as a black man while minimizing the anxiety this produced among white men” (Katz, 2017, p.202). President Obama, as described by Dr. Katz, “…ushered in a new archetype of Presidential manhood. He did this not with blustery displays of anger or martial fervor but with a more cerebral confidence” (Katz, 2017, p.203). President Obama also fought off numerous attacks during his 2008 campaign against his masculinity from both his primary and general election opponents. These attacks did not stick, and the nickname “No Drama Obama” was given to him. Although President Obama did have to redefine manhood that made sense with skin color that did not make the America people uneasy, he still tried tactics that appealed to this need for traditional masculine traits. One activity he is known for is playing basketball. The act of playing basketball is a very traditional masculine activity that black people are known for and makes him more relatable to the voters. While Obama had to carefully define himself in the 2008 race, his main primary opponent former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton created an archetype that women can use in politics to advance themselves. Dr. Katz, argues, “Clinton and her campaign team felt she had to prove her masculinity even to be considered. [She felt] the easiest way to do that was to posture aggressively and signal that she was willing to use the violent power of the state to achieve her foreign policy objectives” (Katz, 2017, p.208). In 2008, then-Junior Senator Hillary Clinton of New York made herself the most traditional masculine person in the Democratic primary with a huge success, barely losing to then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois only to become his Secretary of State. This did not stop her from running after President Obama was unable to run again. Former Secretary of State Clinton doubled down on the idea she is a ‘fighter,’ but many “describe her as combining masculine and
feminine qualities” (Katz, 2017, p.249). Even with her hyperfeminine persona, she was deemed unlikable by the public, especially white men.

A “Wall-Street Journal-NBC News poll in late 2015 found former Secretary of State Clinton unfavorably 64 percent of white men, and to only 26 percent who viewed her favorably” (Katz, 2017, p.249), and former Secretary of State Clinton, although unpopular in 2016, was just as unpopular as her main rival in the General Election Businessman Donald Trump. Businessman Donald Trump clearly represented a stark contrast between both the women he ran against and the man he ended up replacing. During a rally in the summer of 2015, Businessman Donald Trump made the comment the ‘silent majority is back’ (Katz, 2017, p.233). This was a direct appeal that suggests a return to how Republicans have campaigned successfully in the past, starting with President Nixon. Businessman Donald Trump's rhetoric and style were not like previous successful Republican Presidents, but his brash rhetoric and his own distinct persona excited many with traditional values. Businessman Donald Trump’s manhood that created a connection between him and his supporters earlier on in the primary was his willingness to make fun of his opponents and his lack of political correctness (Katz, 2017, p.234). In the 2016 election and his display of a hypermasculine persona, Businessman Trump overpowered the other Republican candidates and made voters think and look at him differently compared to any other male candidate for President had been looked at that point.

During the 2016 election, many were astonished that Businessman Trump did not lose women voters as severely as some would predict based on his track record. Neville-Shepard claims that their behavior actually helped him with voters (R. Neville-Shepard & M. Neville-Shepard). These researchers make this specific claim about the Access Hollywood tapes that were released late in the campaign. The authors went even further and wrote “stories about
Trump’s immoral, misogynistic, and even criminal treatment of women piled up—including claims that he raped his ex-wife, spied on naked Miss Universe contestants, and assaulted other women over the years—none seemed to harm his relationship with his supporters” (R. Neville-Shepard & M. Neville-Shepard). The authors offer a concept called the ‘Pornfied Presidency’ to explain Trump's relationship with his supporters and his inability to be hurt by scandals that a typical candidate would. Women politicians have been pornified in the past, which is consistent with cultural stereotypes of women, but Trump’s “pornification” was different. Trump’s pornification had his supporters view “coded his sexism as dominance befitting a leader, allowed his vulgarity to function as a marker of authenticity, and authorized him to violate taboos” (R. Neville-Shepard & M. Neville-Shepard). Businessman Trump's pornification allowed him to build authenticity with his supporters that have been persistent throughout that campaign. Some of the aspects of ‘pornification’ that appealed to voters were a significant indicator of him getting their vote.

Research on potential voters of Businessman Donald Trump and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was published in 2019 to take a look at how hostile sexism plays a role in voters' choices. Hostile sexism (i.e., misogyny) represents antagonistic attitudes toward women, whereas benevolent sexism represents paternalistic notions of what women should be (Ratliff, Redford, Conway, & Smith). The other type of sexism is Benevolent sexism, where women are viewed as pure creatures who need to be protected and adored. The researchers found that if a person has either type of sexist attitude, they would be more likely to be a trump voter regardless of whether they are a man or a woman (Ratliff, Redford, Conway, & Smith).

The Presidency and gender have been tied together since its inception. Each of the three politicians, President Barack Obama’s, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and President
Donald Trump, represent distant pieces of the construction of how modern American views candidates running for President. Of the three politicians, President Donald Trump's rise to power is the most unpredictable of the three of them. Before he ran for President, he was a reality star/businessman. Businessman Trump’s demagogic rhetoric started with giving a voice to the birther movement in 2012. By the Republican primary, he really solidified his hold on those who made his ascension to the Presidency possible.

Businessman Donald Trump produced a demagogic message from the start of his campaign. Examples of this messaging given are Businessman Trump saying, “Mexicans are mostly rapists; Fox News anchor Megyn Kelly cannot be trusted because “she has blood coming out of her whatever”; Republican Senator John McCain should be ignored because he was captured during the Vietnam War and is, therefore, a loser” (Johnson, 2017). These statements were made to create a mindset he wanted his supporters in when they decided to cast their vote. The comment about Mexicans is Businessman Trump creating an enemy for his voters to be afraid of and portraying himself as defending them from this enemy. At the same time, the other comments about Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona and Fox News Anchor Megan Kelley are to discredit voices other than his and make his voice or voices that agree with him the only credible sources for information or advice. Johnson acknowledges that many rhetorical scholars are careful to classify Businessman Donald Trump as a demagogue. “Drawing from this perspective on demagoguery, [he] argue[s] that Trump’s rhetorical form functions through a toxic, paradoxically abject masculine style whose incoherence is opaque to his critics but meaningful to his adherents, for it helps them imagine themselves as victims of a political tragedy centered around the displacement of “real America” from the political center by a feminized political establishment” (Johnson, 2017). Dr. Johnson claims that Trump’s mention of
domination, strength, and weaponizing supports fears and doubts appeals to a masculine aspect of politics using demagogic rhetoric. This rhetoric is not just Businessman Trump’s continual hostility toward women and minorities but toward democracy itself as a whole. Johnson goes on to say that masculine charisma for any demagogues has an aversion to a democratic space because it does not advance their messaging that usually involves law and order vision. If we break down Businessman Donald Trump's rhetoric during the campaign these messages are similar.

The Demagogue’s Playbook outlines the talking points that Businessman Trump used to create his rhetoric. Businessman Trump used divisive appeals, which were focused on foreigners. Businessman Trump verbally attacked foreigners, but it did not matter whether they were illegal or legal (Posner, 2020, p.239). Posner argues that Businessman Trump's messaging about limiting immigration is not racist. What makes it demagoguery is he made it sound that the immigrant population will steal jobs and engage in terrorism against the electorate (Posner,2020, p.240). Another talking point that was the foundation of Businessman Trump’s rhetoric was his creative personal attacks. These attacks included political rivals and anyone criticizing him (Posner, 2020, p.239). The talking point of personal attacks goes hand in hand with Businessman Trump’s contempt for the truth. Other prominent politicians in American history lied such as Junior Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin, President Andrew Johnson, and President Richard Nixon but “Trump’s lying seem[ed] pathological, mythomaniacal even, unmoored to anything but his personal self-aggrandizement and the humiliation of his enemies” (Posner, 2020, p.243-244). Businessman Trump’s contempt for the truth spurred his frequent attacks on institutions, elites, and conflicting promises on policy he couldn’t deliver. Businessman Trump broke all the rules in 2016 and ran a campaign that mainly historically resembled President Andrew Jackson,
who not only President Trump admired, but Posner argues he was the first demagogue President before Trump (Posner, 2020). Businessman Trump’s demagogue message was not only used to divide the country, but it was originally used on the Republican party in the primaries.

The many authors of *Trump: The 2016 Election That Broke All The Rules* analyzes various aspects of the 2016 election year. The authors explain the political climate the country's state was in and takes note of the two other strong messages in the Republican party fighting Trump for voters. Former Governor of Florida Jeb Bush and Junior Senator Ted Cruz of Texas would have been considered more traditional options and made more mainstream conservative arguments. Former Governor Jeb Bush of Florida was the early favorite in 2016 for the nomination due to his credentials. Former Governor Jeb Bush of Florida represented “compassionate conservatism” that helped elect his brother in 2000 (Costa, 2017, p.100). However, former Governor Jeb Bush of Florida did not have the “harder edge” the voters were looking for, and with his non-confrontational personality along with Mr. Trump’s assault on him as “low energy” former Governor Jeb Bush of Florida, he was quickly defeated after the South Carolina primary (Costa, 2017). The other politician who ended up Businessman Trump’s chief rival in the primary, Junior Senator Ted Cruz of Texas, campaigned to the right of Businessman Trump. Junior Senator Cruz of Texas politically is very much like Businessman Trump and so at the beginning of the primary, ignored him or even praised him. They sought the same voters, so he wanted to focus on other threats and seem authentic about his positions at the same time (Costa, 2017). Junior Senator Cruz of Texas began building a winning coalition, this prompted Businessman Trump to begin using the same tactics he’d been using on his other opponents, slowly eroded his support, and after the Indiana primary, Junior Senator Cruz of Texas suspended his campaign. Businessman Trump ended up winning the Republican nomination with
over 13 million votes, which was more significant than any Republican in history (Costa, 2017, p.98).

How to Critique the Dances Used

This thesis will apply the ideological criticism rhetorical method to demonstrate how Presidents Barack Obama’s legacy and election to the White House, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's plausibility of winning the Presidency, and President Donald Trump's use of demagogic rhetoric in the country propelled him to the White House. Artifacts of the analysis that will be used in this rhetorical criticism will be various speeches, debates, and interviews for both the 08’ and 16’ primary and general elections to construct the ideologies of each politician that appealed to different parts of the electorate. Ideological criticism will be combined with the arguments raised by Dr. Jackson Katz. Concepts such as perceptions of masculinity, rhetoric choices by candidates to show who is the most dominant in a political race, and standards placed on different races and sexes will be highly referenced concepts that will be applied to the argument as a whole. Ideological criticism will provide the framework for how the entire thesis will be explained and Dr. Katz’s concept will not only be a secondary methodical method but an integrated part of the argument as a whole.

Feminist ideals will be used to analyze the power structures in the 2008, 2012 and 2016 Presidential campaigns written within the thesis. Concepts such as race, gender, and social norms will be discussed to prove why Businessman Donald Trump was elected President. Examples of feminist ideals being examined during these election cycles would be the birther movement championed by Businessman Donald Trump, the unfair treatment of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton by the press, and the political personas created by both President Barack Obama
and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to be able to be viable candidates in the American political system. The hegemonic power structure of the political system the American society is based on led to the defeat of then Junior Senator Hillary Clinton of New York twice and swift erosion of the coalition that elected then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois to the Presidency. President Barack Obama, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and Businessman Donald Trump uses discourse to both advance these feminist ideals or try to maintain the status quo.

According to Dr. Sonja Foss, ideologies enable groups to know what is right and wrong and what are conflicts, threats, and competition. An ideology “control[s] and coordinate[s] the actions of those who adhere to them” (Foss, 2018, p.238). The personal desires or issues of an individual do not matter when applying ideological criticism because it is only meant to communicate group beliefs. Dr. Sarah Kornfield describes Ideological criticism as “a mode of criticism that focuses on understanding the system of belief and assumption that guide a rhetorical discourse in its interpretation of reality” (2021, p.136). Ideological criticism has been used to critique hegemonic practices, institutions, and Marxism. Dr. Jackson Katz’s social claims will be an important supplemental aspect of evidence for the argument but how the overall claim is made. Social claims such as the emasculation of candidates, the alpha status of a candidate in a race, and race/sex perception of candidates. Both politicians President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton are a threat to the dominant ideology of American Presidential politics that Dr. Jackson Katz’s mentions in his book that Donald Trump uses to propel him to the Presidency. Businessman Donald Trump also uses the dominant ideology of American society to make his voter base feel he understands their pain and pull off his “one of them” persona.
The Different Dances

In total, this thesis will have six chapters. Chapters Two, Three, Four, and Five will establish the ideologies constructed by President Barack Obama, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and President Donald Trump in the 08’ and 16’ elections that fueled their campaigns. These ideologies will be flushed out in the paper using different artifacts surrounding their campaigns, including speeches, interviews, and debates. Chapter Two will discuss President Barack Obama raise to political power and how he created his coalition that defeated better known candidates such as former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona. It will document the rhetoric used in the contentious primary against then-Senator Hillary Clinton of New York, the night he won the Presidency to reveal his vision for his time in office and the desire to work across the aisle with Republicans making the case that they all want the same goals to be achieved, and finally how President Barack Obama used his rhetoric to not only stay popular while the number of congressional Democrats dwindled but was able with Republican majority in both the chambers of Congress control the narrative of the lack of political wins he had after the Republicans gained control of the House in 2010. Chapter Three will discuss the political and public discourse during the Obama administration with the Republican majority in Congress and how he was able to fend off his 2012 GOP challenger for the Presidency, former Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney. The fourth chapter President Donald Trump’s ideology will be look at and how he was able to bring down experience politicians in the primary and the general election. President Donald Trump blamed the problems happening to the country on career politicians and that his experience as a businessman can spur economic growth but lead to better foreign policy. The fifth chapter explains will feature former
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s transformation into the contentious figure in the 2016
election compared to the 2008 Democratic primary running against then-Junior Senator Barack
Obama of Illinois. The rhetorical balancing at former Secretary of State Clinton had to do to both
seem feminine but also live in a world that is almost exclusive men and where women are treated
as second class. Finally, concluding with how she accepted the losing the Presidency to Donald
Trump without conceding the war for progress. decisions because in his opinion the United
States spends too much time not looking after their own interest like a business. President
Donald Trump hypermasculinity was well documented throughout the campaign and made him
seem more authentic than his general election opponent former Secretary of State Hillary
Clinton. In Chapter Six, or the epilogue, a reinforcement of the thesis’s argument will be
discussed and the review of the ideologies of President Barack Obama, President Donald Trump,
and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Finally, the conclusion will clearly answer how
President Donald Trump came into power and how President Obama and former Secretary of
State Hillary Clinton were the two most important figures that led to the American electorate to
create such a fanatically staunch supporters.
Chapter 2: The Rumba of President Obama

Seducing the Public

Barack Obama was elected on the promise of hope and change. He leaned into the concept of hope and change so much to the degree that he amended his original campaign slogan from “Change We Can Believe In” to “Change We Need” (Obama, 2008) in the middle of his campaign. On the night he became President-Elect, Barack Obama said,

“let us summon a new spirit of patriotism; of service and responsibility where each of us resolves to pitch in and work harder and look after not only ourselves but each other. Let us remember that if this financial crisis taught us anything, it's that we cannot have a thriving Wall Street while Main Street suffers - in this country, we rise or fall as one nation; as one people” (2008).

The vision he laid out during this speech, using feminine rhetoric, is what he wanted to strive for and what his he wanted his legacy as President to be built on. Obama in this segment is providing leadership for the supports but the uses of 1st person plural nouns of us or phrase like “each other” and “one people” the segment points more to an emotional appeal to achieve his desired approach than logic or direct orders makes it feminine political rhetoric (Jamieson). By electing Barack Obama to the Presidency, the electorate hoped to bring a new status quo to the United States. President Obama wanted to create unity among the many different factions in the US to work on the enormous issues facing the country at that time. As he stated in his victory speech that “- in this country, we rise or fall as one nation; as one people”. Obama, during the campaign, had a nickname, and it was “No Drama” Obama” for his campaign style and his
unwillingness to harshly attack his opponent (Katz, 2017). This was his style the entire time while he was in office, and even when he was campaigning for Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election. Obama’s ideology and what made him appealing to many demographics in the electorate. His ideology was unique not just as the first black presidential nominee, but as the first black President.

In his declaration of running for the Presidency on February 10, 2007, Barack Obama said, “Each and every time, a new generation has risen up and done what's needed to be done. Today we are called once more - and it is time for our generation to answer that call. For that is our unyielding faith - that in the face of impossible odds, people who love their country can change it” (Obama, 2007). At the time then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois was tapping into the oldest concept of American patriotism and using it as a framework for the ideology of his campaign. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois again used feminine political rhetoric as he way to get his message across to his supports because of references in the speech segment including himself in call to action. These are not orders but him asking and personally connecting to the audience making feminine political rhetoric (Blankenship and Robson). His vision of the future in his 2008 campaign speeches was known for inspiring voters and was tested not only by his campaign opponents in the primary and the general election but was well liked by different voting blocks. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois, in his declaration, says, “In the face of war, you believe there can be peace. In the face of despair, you believe there can be hope. In the face of a politics that's shut you out, that's told you to settle, that's divided us for too long, you believe we can be one people, reaching for what's possible, building that more perfect union.” (Obama, 2007) speaks about the concept that he wanted to define himself as a
candidate but as what he wanted to inspire in those voting for him. As a black candidate, then-
Senator Obama’s relationship with race is fundamentally different from the usual traditional
white male President. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois understands these differences and
remarks in his declaration to address them that “It was here, in Springfield, where North, South,
East and West come together that I was reminded of the essential decency of the American
people - where I came to believe that through this decency, we can build a more hopeful
America. And that is why, in the shadow of the Old State Capitol, where Lincoln once called on
a divided house to stand together, where common hopes and common dreams still, I stand before
you today to announce my candidacy for President of the United States” (Obama, 2007). Since
Obama is black, he cannot rely on usually white patriarchal authority as a way to be Presidential,
so his approach to racial and gender norms was different in his Presidential campaign in 2008.
His rhetorical style continues to display a feminine skew due to the President continue
connecting to the audience and not commanding them. He declares that,

“That is why this campaign can't only be about me. It must be about us - it must be about what
we can do together. This campaign must be the occasion, the vehicle, of your hopes, and your
dreams. It will take your time, your energy, and your advice - to push us forward when we're
doing right, and to let us know when we're not. This campaign has to be about reclaiming the
meaning of citizenship, restoring our sense of common purpose, and realizing that few obstacles
can withstand the power of millions of voices calling for change” (Obama, 2007).

Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois is framing this campaign to be different to be more than
just what he wants to do for the country. He wants to bring together Americans to create change.
Continually using a feminine rhetorical approach. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois was a
new face to national politics, and he called for change. This made him authentic and attractive to the electorate.

Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois during his 2008 campaign launch used a mixture of masculine and feminine political rhetoric to define his campaign and how he wanted to frame the arguments he will be making for him being elected President. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois referring to he wanted to viewed as proctor and as leader (Presidential) by “answering” a call for service and bring together people; he fused feminine political rhetoric with these masculine statements by making references to his personal experiences that he and the voters are answering the same call to connect with them.

Obama Performing a Solo

Barack Obama, running in 2008, had a tough balancing act to accomplish. He not only needed to appeal to the democratic base in the primary, but especially needed to appeal to black voters and do so without alienating white voters. At the beginning of the election cycle that year, Hillary Clinton, who was then the Junior Senator from New York, was the front runner for the Democratic Nomination for President. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois was still relatively new to the national stage even though he gave an engaging and well-received keynote speech at the 2004 Democratic Convention for then-Senior Senator John Kerr of Massachusetts that propelled him to stardom (Coll). He was of mixed race, and he had lived out of the United States for some time, making him not the typical mold of a black politician. As a black candidate, he also could not avoid the issue of talking about race in some fashion since how historic his ascension to the Presidency would be. However, he tried his hardest to talk in generalities when
it came to personal stories. An example of this was then-Junior Senator Obama’s Keynote address at the 2004 Democratic Convention. Sen. Obama that night spoke,

“My parents shared not only an improbable love; they shared an abiding faith in the possibilities of this nation. They would give me an African name, Barack, or "blessed," believing that in a tolerant America your name is no barrier to success. They imagined me going to the best schools in the land, even though they weren't rich, because in a generous America you don’t have to be rich to achieve your potential. They are both passed away now. Yet, I know that, on this night, they look down on me with pride. I stand here today, grateful for the diversity of my heritage, aware that my parents’ dreams live on in my precious daughters (Obama, 2004).

Even though this was President Obama’s first introduction into the national spotlight he used feminine political rhetorical to not only get his message across, he used to support fellow politicians.

Obama embraced that his name was not a normal American name but was African and that what hopes and dreams were instilled in it by his parents. Later many of the ideas of his presidential speeches used these same ideas. Then-Junior Senator Obama’s speech allowed him to talk about race without anyone feeling uncomfortable. He was made to seem like any American with hopes and dreams that were given to him by his parents, which he gave to his daughters. The theme that a then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois ran on started that night when he spoke and said, “there's not a liberal America and a conservative America - there's the United States of America. There's not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America; there's the United States of America” (Obama, 2004).
Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois during his keynote address used feminine political rhetoric during his public address. He used personal experiences to strength his persuasive argument for then-Senior Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts. Obama using his personal story allowed for John Kerry to seem more inclusive and show diversity in his supports but was good for Obama as well because he was able to connect with the electorate on the national stage. Obama is continually able to use feminine political rhetoric without looking weaken as candidate or as politician is his unique position as black man, which requires to display different sides of him in order to make relevant and persuasive.

Then-Junior Senator Obama’s first political move of the 2008 Democratic primary was to court black voters away from then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York and persuade them how his ideology would be beneficial to their community. He started persuading black voters with a speech in Selma, Alabama, on March 4, 2007. This date marked the 42nd anniversary of “Bloody Sunday”. Obama had to make an impactful speech because the frontrunner Hillary Clinton was giving an address in Selma as well. Obama skillfully started his speech by referencing Christian Bible characters. Religion plays an important part in many Black Americans' lives, making the rhetorical choices to these references appropriate Obama said,

“we are in the presence today of a lot of Moseses. We're in the presence today of giants whose shoulders we stand on, people who battled, not just on behalf of African Americans but on behalf of all of America; that battled for America's soul, that shed blood, that endured taunts and torment and in some cases gave -- torment and in some cases gave the full measure of their devotion. Like Moses, they challenged Pharaoh, the princes, powers who said that some are atop and others are at the bottom, and that's how it's always going to be” (Obama, 2007).
Obama uses of religious scripture and connecting to the audience is another example of Obama’s rhetorical legacy steeped in feminine rhetoric. This speech was incredibly effective because the black community use religion as a way to make connection but a pillar for ethics. These voters were desperately needed to beat then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York because if then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois wanted to start gaining supports in order to gain traction blacks for him is the easiest target demographic for him to advertise too.

Obama proved his blackness by acknowledging those black leaders in the Civil Rights Movement who came before him. Using biblical characters allowed him to connect with his intended audience more. He also did not alienate white people and by not referring to the usual white guilt that some other black politicians thrive on by saying, “We're in the presence today of giants whose shoulders we stand on, people who battled, not just on behalf of African Americans but on behalf of all of America; that battled for America's soul” (Obama, 2007). Obama skillfully did not alienate white voters by establishing a tightrope colorblind view on race. This vision gives the audience a mental image of how blacks are still struggling or being attacked in multiple ways and still endorses the notion that the country had equal opportunities for all who tried their hardest. Obama told the audience,

“it reminds us that we still got a lot of work to do and that the basic enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, the injustice that still exists within our criminal justice system, the disparity in terms of how people are treated in this country continues. It has gotten better. And we should never deny that it's gotten better. But we shouldn't forget that better is not good enough. That until we have absolute equality in this country in terms of people being treated on the basis of
their color or their gender, that that is something that we've got to continue to work on” (Obama, 2007).

Then-Junior Senator Obama's credentials as a member of the black community and staying true to his political message on race were tested by the release of a video by ABC News of his Pastor Rev. Jeremiah Wright of Trinity United Church of Christ in March of 2008. ABC News reporters Brian Ross and Rehab El-Buri wrote, “The Rev. Jeremiah Wright, Obama's pastor for the last 20 years at the Trinity United Church of Christ on Chicago's south side, ha[d] a long history of what even Obama's campaign aides concede[d] [as] "inflammatory rhetoric," including the assertion that the United States brought on the 9/11 attacks with its own "terrorism.". The ABC News report also interviewed a congregation member of Trinity United Church of Christ and responded to the video that “[they] wouldn't call it radical. I call it being black in America" (El-Buri and Ross, 2008). The video release led to Obama giving one of his most famous speeches of the 2008 campaign and solidified Obama’s perception of race in the public mind.

In his speech titled “A More Perfect Union,” Senator Obama helped himself stop the political fallout from his association with Rev. Jeremiah Wright and allow him to talk about issues that he rarely touched on in the campaign and even into his eventual Presidency. Then-Senator Obama explained he wanted,

“to continue the long march of those who came before us, a march for a more just, more equal, more free, more caring and more prosperous America. I chose to run for the presidency at this moment in history because I believe deeply that we cannot solve the challenges of our time
unless we solve them together – unless we perfect our union by understanding that we may have different stories, but we hold common hopes; that we may not look the same and we may not have come from the same place, but we all want to move in the same direction – towards a better future for of children and our grandchildren” (Obama, 2008).

This speech was a master use of feminine political rhetoric by taking an association that is hurting him political and allow the public to hear his side of the story. By not attacking he was able to get the public to listen and it allowed them to separate both from even with a long history.

Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois wanted his coalition to be made up of diverse people, and he emphasizes that in this speech while still holding on to the vision of the American dream that many in America have. This is a continuation of his tightrope ideology on race on not alliancing parts of his coalition, especially white voters. Obama, in this speech, lays out some common ground themes for his supporters. Obama continues his speech by saying,

“This belief comes from my unyielding faith in the decency and generosity of the American people. But it also comes from my own American story. I am the son of a black man from Kenya and a white woman from Kansas. I was raised with the help of a white grandfather who survived a Depression to serve in Patton's Army during World War II and a white grandmother who worked on a bomber assembly line at Fort Leavenworth while he was overseas. I've gone to some of the best schools in America and lived in one of the world's poorest nations. I am married to a black American who carries within her the blood of slaves and slaveowners – an inheritance we pass on to our two precious daughters (Obama, 2008).
Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois using his own personal stories as a lens into his perspective into the world is again brought up just like in his speech at the Democratic Convention and declaration for running for President in 2008. This is another use of feminine political rhetoric. Even though then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois cannot connect with American black voters whose older generation of family members were slaves, he skillfully uses his wife as a way to appeal to them. He also appeals to the other demographics by mentioning the part of the family who raised him, which happened to be white. This common ground rhetoric happens before then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois fiercely denounces Rev. Wright not only to stop the political backlash, he has been facing but continue his message if unity. He says, “we've heard my former pastor, Reverend Jeremiah Wright, use incendiary language to express views that have the potential not only to widen the racial divide, but views that denigrate both the greatness and the goodness of our nation; that rightly offend white and black alike” (Obama, 2008).

Barack Obama, after this incident, never had issues courting black voters or how he viewed race in America. Then-Junior Senator Obama's big task during the general election was to appeal to the white voters who voted for then-Senator Clinton of New York to vote for him in the general election instead of John McCain, whom some felt more comfortable with. Obama, from 2004 to 2008, carried 2% more white people than John Kerry (Katz, 2016; Hutching et el, 2020; Ropecenter editors).

Barack Obama won 43% of white male voters in the general election, which was the highest a Democratic nominee for President has won this demographic group since Jimmy Carter was running for President (Katz, 2016; Hutching et el, 2020; Ropecenter editors). Even though
Obama lost the voter bloc by 10%, he increased support with them compared to other democratic nominees during the general election. Whites were never Obama's strongest voting bloc, even in the primary election. Then-Junior Senator Hillary Clinton was stronger with the white men and woman voter especially white women, who were 53% more likely to support her over Obama, and those without a degree were also 53% to back her compared to Obama (Pew research editors). To ensure that then-Junior Senator Hillary Clinton’s supporters would support Senator Barack Obama, they came together for a joint campaign event in Unity, New Hemisphere, on June 27, 2008, after the primaries were over, so then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York could publicly endorse him. In these stump speeches that both politicians gave, they brought up traditional American motifs. Then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York said in her speech statements such as “the purpose of America, to move toward that more perfect union, to make that progress that ensures every generation to come will have the same opportunities and blessings that we have taken for granted” (Clinton, 2008) or “That’s why both of us were in this race: because we believe in the old-fashioned idea that public service is about helping people. Helping them solve their problems and live out their own dreams. Because we've had every opportunity and blessing in our own lives and we want the same for every American” (Clinton, 2008). Then-Junior Senator Obama's statements after then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York were a thank you to all the years of Clinton’s services and a continuing the rhetoric motifs Clinton was using to talk about America. Campaign events like the one he had with Clinton were one of the reasons that Obama won over more white voters because Obama never made race or issues concerning minorities the central theme of his campaign. Even though Barack Obama's public statements on race were very colorblind, he specifically used talking points then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York used throughout her campaign in 2008 to attract her voters.
Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois, in his joint appearance with then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York, says “And that's why in this moment, we have to come together not just as Democrats, but also as Americans, united by our understanding that there's no problem we can't solve, no challenge we cannot meet. As one nation, as one people” (Obama, 2008). Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois in claiming Americans, in general, he has reaching out to those outside of his coalition. Then-Junior Senator Clinton’s coalition was whiter and the working class and joining with her allowed for Obama’s credibility and popularity with her coalition to have a better view on his candidacy. He as he has done for most of the race, did not mention race at all but spoke in general about people especially using language like referring to the electorate as Americans. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois wanted the coalition that he and then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York built to become one, and in order to accomplish this goal most of his campaign speeches continually talk about unity allowing for America to meet the challenges it faces.

Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois usually talked about his children, and in his other campaign speeches, he used his personal stories as a way to connect with the audience than directly offering up policy compared to then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York. In this stump speech, he offered some policies and says, “From the day they're born to the day they graduate from college, that we will invest in early childhood education to close the achievement gap, that we will recruit an army of new teachers and give them more pay and give them more support and make sure that we're giving scholarships to every young person in America who wants to go to college and exchange for community service. That's the choice that we have in this election” (Obama, 2008). Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois makes directs appeals to the working
class and seniors who broke for then-Junior Senator Clinton of New York more by announcing more policy action he would like to accomplish as President saying,

“When it comes to our struggling economy, we can allow the divide between Main Street and Wall Street to grow, or we can ensure that our prosperity is once again a tide that's lifting all boats. We can have a tax code that rewards wealth and hands out billions of dollars more to big corporations and multi-millionaires or we can provide $1,000 tax cut to 95 percent of families in America, start rewarding work and not just wealth and eliminate income taxes for seniors making $50,000 a year or less” (Obama, 2008).

Obama again uses feminine political rhetoric to connect to his voters and express his ideology. That the system only works for rich people and people who are in the lower economic classes are left behind.

In several battleground states such as Pennsylvania and Iowa, then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois gave remarks aiming to resonate with white working-class voters. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois made remarks to the Alliance for American Manufacturing in April 2008 and said,

“we've seen the number of American-owned steel companies dwindle down. For decades, our economic policies have been written to pump up a corporate bottom line, rather than promote what's right, without any consideration for the burden we all bear when workers are abused, or the environment is destroyed. It's an outrage, but it's not an accident - because corporate
lobbyists in Washington are writing our laws and putting their client’s interests ahead of what's fair for the American people” (Obama, 2008).

This statement and the speech in general directly appealed to whites as a demographic because many midwestern states employed white factory workers who were losing their jobs at this time. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois spoke about how horrible companies are and how they are hurting the electorate. Blacks and other minorities do not usually need to be told how the country is not working for them because they have first-hand knowledge in more than just their job. This was also an example of masculine political communication. Obama displayed impersonal and logical rhetoric in this statement. Then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois by making these impersonal and logical arguments allowed for him to seem Presidential (like a leader) allowing the normal type of speech allowed in the political arena be effective.

As a black man, Barack Obama had to show off his masculinity and values to the American people without making essential members of the electorate uncomfortable because of his race. As a black man, Barack Obama could not only rely on traditional white patriarchal values to win the election. He also needed to create an image for himself as different than the one portrayed by presidential candidates. The “Brand[ing] Obama [did]… effectively negated the need for party image and policy commitments by being a strong personality” (Zavattaro, 2010). Then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois ran a campaign meant to appeal to the greatest number of people possible compared to party leaders like then- Junior Senator Hillary Clinton of New York was doing. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois was frequently seen playing basketball during the campaign, making him seem athletic, which was a traditional trait to have more masculine man allowing him to seem more relatable. He used a calm and soothing tone of
voice when making speeches or talking on camera. Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois, instead of making himself look like an alpha dog like most Presidential candidates, he made himself look like the smartest guy in the room, which was different (Katz, 2016). The persona Obama created kept up during both his campaign and his Presidency. His calm and relaxed persona that portrayed thoughtfulness compared to President George W. Bush got him the nickname “No drama Obama” (Katz, 2016). President George W. Bush persona was a man another man would like to have a beer with and a person who does not seem to think deep about decision. He seemed was a person who went with a gut, which a stark contrast to then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois. This made him personable and likeable. Obama’s political vision always tried to be an example for the American people and show it is always well thought out.

Problems Leading the Dance

President Obama, during the 2008 campaign spoke about many ways he wanted to be a different kind of President with a more unified government, this ended up not being the case. Throughout Barack Obama's Presidency, his guiding principle was for the passage of all significant legislation to be a bipartisan effort. He extensively spoke of this vision for his Presidency during the 2008 election and reinforced the idea in his victory speech. Obama was always optimistic about the Republicans working with him. During an interview with Matt Lauer of NBC “Today” show, when pressured on the lack of Republican support for his signature stimulus package, Obama answered, “Well, look, the important thing is getting the thing passed. And I've done extraordinary outreach, I think, to Republicans, because they have some good ideas, and I want to make sure that those ideas are incorporated. I am confident that by the time
we actually have the final package on the floor that we are going to see substantial support” (Obama, 2008). The final package passed on February 13, 2009. The final vote total was the House passed the bill 246-183 with no Republican support and the Senate 60-38 with three moderate Republicans from blue-leaning states supporting the bill (Rogers, 2009). Barack Obama’s vision of the Presidency creating opportunities for bipartisanship never truly hit the ground running but allowed him to seem above it all and willing to compromise, which was how he expressed his masculinity in the Presidency. Even Barack Obama’s other signature achievement of his Presidency that he modeled after his soon-to-be opponent in 2012, Mitt Romney’s Healthcare law in Massachusetts, was not enough to persuade Republicans in Congress to work with him. The bill was passed without Republican support and through the reconciliation process (Herszenhorn & Pear, 2010).

Barack Obama, as President, always practiced what he preached, which is what made him a great leader and made him connect with many different people in the electorate. Barack Obama wanted to lead the country forward. One of his most significant steps was to diversify the cabinet and Supreme Court and move forward with civil rights issues such as gay marriage. Examples of the first of many choices Obama made were the first male and female black Attorney General and the first Latina Supreme Court justice. At the same time, Obama made politically risky decisions, such as his support of gay marriage and his choice not to defend the Defense of Marriage Act. The issue of gay marriage just an election ago was one issue that John Kerry, Obama’s second Secretary of State, lost the Presidency to George W. Bush, who was unpopular. Barack Obama being the leader he is announced it in an interview with a gay black woman Robin Roberts of ABC. During the interview, he said, “I've just concluded that—for me
personally, it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that—I think same-sex couples should be able to get married. Now—I have to tell you that part of my hesitation on this has also been I didn't want to nationalize the issue. There's a tendency when I weigh in to think suddenly it becomes political and it becomes polarized” (Obama, 2012).

Ultimately, Barack Obama’s significant achievements were when he and his party went on the political offensive and passed legislation on mostly party lines. Also, some of Obama's policy changes did not reflect what many parts of the country were supporting at the time, but he thought that if he supported it, the country would move with him. Obama was the epitome of the “hope and change” he promised to deliver in the 2008 election cycle but running in an election and the political reality while in office are two separate realities every politician has to go through. Barack Obama always acknowledged that the only part that mattered was advancing his legislative agenda but never relents in trying to bridge the gap between his White House and the Republicans in Congress. Even with Vice-President Joe Biden, whom he sent numerous times to whip up votes for his bills, it was always an uphill battle to gain any Republican support without them taking more than they wanted to give. Barack Obama’s brand of “being above the fray” was compelling, and it was one of his defining characteristics as a President that was challenged in 2012 without success.

President Obama was not just elected with a mandate from the electorate and an ambitious domestic agenda, he wanted to change the way the United States was seen under President George W. Bush. Many felt that under President George W. Bush, the United States had lost its credibility around the world, and the two wars that started under his Administration were badly managed and. President Obama represented progress in the world in those areas
under European colonial rule. This caused him to be even more popular around the world than in the United States. According to the Pew Research Center, in 2009, he had a 74% approval rating in the US, while in Great Britain, France, Germany, and Kenya, he had an 86%, 91%, 93%, and 94%, respectively. President Obama understood this and tried his hardest to tamper it and make sure to always reiterate that he was the President of the United States.

At the beginning of his Presidency, he received the Noble Peace Prize and saw it not only as an honor but as a problem for his Presidency in its infancy. While in Norway in his remarks he says

“I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the considerable controversy that your generous decision has generated. (Laughter.) In part, this is because I am at the beginning, and not the end, of my labors on the world stage… But perhaps the most profound issue surrounding my receipt of this prize is the fact that I am the Commander-in-Chief of the military of a nation in the midst of two wars. … Still, we are at war, and I'm responsible for the deployment of thousands of young Americans to battle in a distant land. Some will kill, and some will be killed. And so I come here with an acute sense of the costs of armed conflict -- filled with difficult questions about the relationship between war and peace, and our effort to replace one with the other” (Obama, 2009).

The expectations that were placed on President Obama was great not only at home in the United States but abroad. President Obama was afraid of expectations being get too high, only to result in the failure of his Presidency by not being able to meet all the demands that the world placed on him when he was first elected. This speech was to remind the world that he was a
wartime President but with a will to end the wars and create peace. Since it was in the beginning of his first term, and the award was given out as a gesture of hope that with the change of leadership in the United State would bring positive change to the world at large (Norwegian Noble committee, 2009). The speech Obama gave allowed the President to show another example of a combination of feminine and masculine rhetoric. The President refers to his position as President and his duties he needs complete, which is logical, impersonal, and talks about being in a role of power is masculine political rhetoric. When the President uses both the singular and plural pronouns to talk about war and peace it is the President incorporating feminine rhetoric in the statement to increase the ability to connect with audience.

At the beginning of his Presidency, Obama always showed humility and tried to keep the narrative on the crucial issues of his Presidency. He had to show these so expectations were not too high for him to reach, and he also had to continue to inspire as he did during his campaign. This political balancing act defined his Presidency and scared the Republican party in Congress so much that it was the top priority to stop his agenda and make him a one-term President. This political balancing act and ideological philosophy of his White House allowed him to control the narrative even when his Presidency slowly lost the Congress to the other party. One of President Obama’s biggest balancing act was the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Not only did he want to take Democrats’ opinions into account, but he also wanted this to be a bipartisan effort. President Obama campaigned hard for a public option in the final bill of the ACA, but the bill ended up being similar to the Massachusetts healthcare system. This was made to attract Republican votes and get conservative Democrats on the side of the bill. Republicans in
Congress still, even with concessions from the President and Democrats, did not vote for the bill, and was passed with only Democrat support in both the House and Senate (Silverleib).

**Taking Turns: Who to Pick?**

President Obama in 2016 had a huge stake in who became the nominee of the Democratic Party. Many of the policies he championed during his tenure in the White House were in jeopardy by the Republican party. He was paired with a congress controlled by the other party. This had stalled agenda and looked to his executive authority to propel his agenda forward. President Obama used executive authority when it came to foreign agenda, such as putting sanctions on Russia or Syria and providing aid to African countries (archives.gov editors). While President Obama also used it for his domestic agenda by signing executive orders to protect federal land and giving federal contractors paternal paid time off (archives.gov editors). One of the most important programs he did through executive authority is DACA. DACA is significant and at this moment, controversial because many think this was an overreach by Obama when a bill that would give citizenship to children who lived their whole lives in the US was not passed. This meant he placed helping the Democratic nominee for President become his successor a top priority for him. Unfortunately, due to both the ideology he followed during his time in Presidential politics and the tradition of not getting involved in the primary when not running for reelection, he chose not to endorse a candidate. During this cycle, Obama had only a prior cabinet member, Hillary Clinton, in the race due to Joe Biden declining to run do to his grief the death of his son.
The two major Democratic presidential candidates were Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State under Barack Obama during his 1st term, and Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont. Bernie Sanders, just like Obama, excited the more liberal wings of the Democratic Party during the primaries and, just like him, seemed unelectable. Many of the same voters who supported Obama over Clinton the last time around were excited for Sanders, and Bernie was popular with younger members of the Democratic party. The difference between the two men was temperament and where they were on the political spectrum.

Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont as a white man can have a persona that is different and perceived differently than Barack Obama. Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, a white man, had more room to use more forceful language without alienating voters. Secretary Clinton and even President Obama had to be careful how they showed emotion in public places because of their sex and race, while Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont being white and a man, made these emotional outbursts of anger that echoed what his supporters felt more appealing but also more acceptable to do. Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont, even though he was Jewish, looked more like the traditional mold of an American President, which made him not intimidating to voters compared to if President Obama campaigned using forceful rhetoric. Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont had a socialist tilt to his politics, and he looked more like the normal politicians seen in the past, even though he wanted to make the argument that he was the best person to keep Obama-era policies in place to multiply parts of the electorate. His tone in his speeches was actually what drew his supporters to him, which he and Barack Obama had in common. Bernie tried to convince the Democratic voters that he was the best person to keep Obama-era policies in place and build on them. Senior Senator Sanders of
Vermont was able to harness the liberal rage building up against Republicans in Congress and the views of the younger, more left-leaning wing of his party. As Obama portrayed himself above the partisan gripes and always looked to control the narrative. He was able to make the Republicans face political backlash for being obstructionists to President Obama’s agenda without offering any alternatives. Showing they care more about stopping President Obama’s agenda then help govern. Senior Senator Sanders’s persona was seen as a fighter in the trenches fighting for the socialist agenda. Many of Senior Senator Sander’s supporters felt that his many years of battling big companies and upholding socialist values made him more authentic than his opponent and felt he would continue moving the country further to the political left that started under President Obama. Supporters felt that the mainstream Democratic politicians were too concerned with getting elected than producing good policy, and Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont campaigned against the establishment.

Even though President Barack Obama never endorsed anyone in the Democratic primary race in 2016 until former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton clinched the nomination, many thought that secretly this was planned from the beginning for her to succeed him as President. President Obama was a student of history, and one of the many patterns in US history is the Secretary of State running or becoming President after the former they served under was term-limited. Then-Senator Hillary Clinton becoming President Obama’s first Secretary of State continued that tradition, and her stepping down after the 2012 General election many speculated was her laying the groundwork for her presidential run in 2016. Whether or not this was true, many speculated about this plan due to President Obama’s the amount of vigorous campaigning he was going to do for her (Montanaro).
The Man Always Leading

In 2016, the election results was not as much a rejection of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, as it was President Obama. He went out and campaigned for her as hard as possible, making the case that the policies and victories he had won during the election would need a Secretary Clinton in the White House to be safe from reversal. During President Obama's tenure in the White House, the country became more divided than together, even though he campaigned and preached togetherness. This was the exact opposite of what Trump campaigned on and stood for in the eyes of those who voted for him and those in the political class. During the rest of his time in office, President Barack Obama continued to run his White House as he always had, even with a Trump administration looming. Still, with the burden of an elected office behind him, President Barack Obama shed this political ideology he was so famous for and put it into fighting to keep his policy's victories alive. If it were not for the historical nature of his Presidency and the way he was able to control the narrative even when losing the fight, an individual such as Donald Trump would not have the ability to create a perception to allow for someone with his viewpoint to become a viable candidate for President in modern times.
Chapter 3: The Tengo of Governing

Dancing in Harmony

President Obama was elected to the Presidency in 2008 promising hope and change to the American people. The 8 years the United States were led by President Obama was an exciting time because of all the changes socially and politically that were happening. President Obama was able to get major pieces of legislation done that defined his Presidency early because of the supermajorities his party had in both chambers of Congress. Laws such as the Affordable Care Act, The American Recovery and Reinvestment of 2009 Act (Stimulus Package), and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act were possible because of these majorities. Barack Obama during his first term was ambitious and had the momentum from his decisive electoral victory over Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona. This ambition and momentum drove him in his viewpoint to accomplish much needed reforms to how America and Washington D.C. worked. Obama came into office with goals and a mandate from the American people to try to achieve the goals he campaigned on, but Republicans, especially in the House of Representatives, made it difficult for the President to achieve them. Even with the Democratic party having supermajorities in both Chambers of Congress during Obama’s first two years in office (Divided States Of America 2019) it was an uphill battle for him. President Obama achieving his legislative goals became harder and more stressful with the rise of the Tea Party and loss of the majority in the House of Representatives, in 2010 mid-term elections and the eventual loss of the Senate in 2014. When this happened Obama had to find new ways of
advancing his agenda with a Congress that was hard to deal with. Although President Obama stretched the limits of his executive authority throughout his Presidency during second term, he exercised it more sparingly to advance his agenda without the need of Congressional approval (Divided States Of America 2019).

The Republican party coming off the 2008 election were concerned with what a President-Elect Obama had in store in his first term in office. The GOP was in the minority in both chambers of Congress and had low approval ratings from the electorate (Divided States of America 2019). The Republicans party leaders decided that they were going to make life difficult for a President-Elect Obama when he took over after President Bush (Divided States of America 2019). GOP members of Congress wanted to stall all of President Obama’s agenda including his plans to save the country from the Great Recession. In order to stall President Obama’s priorities during the early part of his administration, Republicans members thought by framing the disagreements between them and the White House would hurt President Obama political making him seem ineffective as leader (Divided States of America 2019). With the rise of the Tea Party movement during the first two years of Obama’s first term culminating in a red wave in the midterm elections, the Republican party split into two separate camps. This new movement caused two different ideologies in the GOP caucus in Congress. The ideologies were the traditional Republican politicians represented by Speaker John Boehner and Senior Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the Republican caucus leader in the Senate, and those aligned with the Tea Party, who are considered more extreme conservatives both socially and fiscally, and less likely to compromise their principles. Tea party members of the Republican caucus
would be then-Congressman Paul Ryan and Kevin McCarthy and Majority Leader Eric Cantor (*Divided States Of America* 2019).

This chapter will analyze the 8 years of the liberal policies President Obama put into place during his time in office and the Republican response to these progressive policies that led them to retake the House in 2010 and the Senate in 2014, which laid the groundwork for how voters in the party wanted from their nominee for President in 2016 that were different from nominees in 2008 and 2012 who ran against President Obama. The chapter will use speeches, documentaries, interviews, and political news outlets as evidence to show how President Obama turned from becoming a candidate that was viewed as someone who could bring the parties together to a polarizing figure in American politics. President Obama becoming this polarizing figure allowed for a countermovement, the Tea Party Movement, evolved to combat his agenda. The rhetoric spoken by President Obama and by political foes framed him during his 8 years in office made the public view him as a divisive figure than an unifying figure changing the perception of President Obama in office was pictured during the campaign compared to into office.

**Obama’s Failing Seductive Dance**

President Obama won the presidency in 2008 promising that he would change Washington and bring people together. During the first two years in office with Democratic supermajorities in the Congress, he had tried to include the minority as much as possible. Once elected his first priority was to save the economy from financial collapse and facilitated the passage of one his signature ideas to save America, a massive stimulus package to put money
into the economy. President Obama reached out to Republican members of Congress to help craft this very important bill in the new President’s agenda. Members of the GOP in Congress, before having any real debate received an email from their Minority Whip Eric Cantor saying he would not support the bill at all (Divided States Of America 2019). This signal from the Republican leader in House led to all Republican voting against the stimulus package in both the House and Senate. Congressman Cantor told NPR that “If we're going to deliver on trying to revive this economy, a stimulus bill has got to be focused like a laser on the preservation, protection and creation of jobs,” (Cantor, 2009) and that “There are some terrific tax provisions in the bill,” Cantor says. But he's quick to add, "If we're going to be meaningful about what we're going to do taxwise, we have got to be much more focused on the real job generators." (Montagne, 2009). This was the beginning of the GOP plan to frame President Obama as unreasonable causing him to become the polarizing figure in American politics he became by the end of his Presidency. The opposition by denying President Obama the ability to change Washington and come up with bipartisan solutions they not only weaken the President at the height of his popularity, but they also tried to control the narrative framing the President and Democrats as unwilling to compromise, and their ideas as too expensive (Divided States Of America).

The “Stimulus Package” passed Congress on a party line vote and that was a win-win on both sides of the aisle. President Obama succeeded in getting through a major piece of his agenda through and the Republicans were slowly turning public opinion against the President. Starting with the passage of Stimulus Package, President Obama’s public opinion polls started to go down (Gallup). Obama’s public opinion polls after the passage of the American Rescue and
Reinvestment of 2009 Act was between 65-60% and by August of 2009 fell to 50% or lower (Gallup). The Republicans strategy was working and making the case that President Obama was not only too radical for America, but he did not work hard enough with Republicans to cut deals. President Obama came in as the unity candidate and wanted to be a figure that could bring unity to both parties. President Obama had a famous line that he used in many different forms through his time in the national spotlight, but it was introduced in his keynote address in the 2004 Democratic Convention. He said,

“Well, I say to them tonight, there’s not a liberal America and a conservative America-there’s the United States of America. There’s not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America; there’s the United States of America. The pundits like to slice-and-dice our country into Red and Blue States; Red States for Republicans, Blue States for Democrats. But I’ve got news for them, too. We worship an awesome God in Blue States, and we don’t like federal agents poking around our libraries in the Red States. We coach Little League in the Blue States and have gay friends in the Red States. There are patriots who opposed the war in Iraq and patriots who supported it. We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes, all of us defending the United States of America (Obama, 2004).

President Obama is displaying feminine political rhetoric in this section by using the singular and plural versions of first person by acknowledging experience or similar felt by himself and the people he is talking to in order to appeal to them to increase the effectiveness of his endorsement of then Senior Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts.

Then-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois was unable to sustain this campaign narrative when he went on to become President. Obama’s narrative that he was known for during the
campaign became tainted by the Republicans. Barack Obama when he was running in 2008 and during his transition into office he looked to President Lincoln as a way to structure his administration (Hornick, 2009). President Lincoln served as President during the Civil War and said in his First Inaugural Address, “We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection” (Lincoln, 1861).

Obama during his 2008 as well as much of his first term in office spoke of home, change, and bridging the divided between parties for the betterment of the country. The GOP members of Congress by continuously framing Obama as radical and unreasonable not only damaged him politically, but slowly changed the President’s rhetoric making it sounded divisive. The President’s divisive tone presented a counter argument to the one the Republicans argument was presenting to the American public. The narrative that Obama created during the campaign stemmed from his life. Obama being raised by a white family but himself being black and having a unique name. President Obama ran on the experience that he did not “fit” anywhere, and he had to create his own identity allowed him to be able to understand people who think or are different from him did not remain intact.

President Obama was perceived as not being an effective leader when trying to negotiate with the Republicans in Congress. Many of the moves he made during this first couple of negotiations with Republicans were embarrassing for him because he was not acting like a President but still like he was a Senator on Capitol Hill. For, example President Obama already came into the debate with Republicans already giving concessions and starting to negotiate from a weaken position because he would have to give up more than he wanted making it easier for the Republicans to sour the negotiations (Divided States Of America 2019). If President Obama
had started at a position of strength, asked what he wanted in the legislation before presenting the bill to initiating negotiations with the Republicans he would have had better success getting results because he would not have shown up to the table already in a weaken position due to the concessions he already made.

President Obama was so invested in the idea of bipartisanship that he doubled down on the idea when he decided to tackle Healthcare. President Obama and his team knew this would be a difficult task to get through Congress and that it would take more than bringing together Democrats and Republican to get it done. In the administration’s opinion it would take everyone involved in the healthcare field as well (Divided States Of America 2019). President Obama did not want healthcare to be a long-drawn-out debate because it gave the public and those opposed to it more time to turn against what President Obama was proposing.

Republicans saw the Healthcare debate as another opportunity to hurt President Obama politically and embarrass him. The GOP planned to pretend to be interested in working with the President on Healthcare reform but secretly wanted to keep the debate going as long as possible to cause public opinion to shift against the proposed healthcare law and then vote “No” on the bill (Divided States Of America 2019). The plan to control the narrative when dealing with the Obama Administration the senior GOP members of Congress came up with worked better than expected and was one of the reasons the Tea Party movement was such a success allowing for Conservatives in Congress to become a check on Obama. The GOP leaders wanted to change the direction the country was going under the Obama Administration. This movement became known as the Tea Party and during the midterms in 2010 allowed the Republicans to flip the
House making them the majority party in the lower chamber with significant gains in both the House and Senate (Reed, 2010).

Healthcare was a contentious issue. The longer it was debated in Congress the more it electrified the conservative base against Barack Obama. Not only were the Republicans slowing down healthcare reform, but the infighting between Democrats created misinformation and slowed down the bill’s creation because they all had different opinions on how healthcare reform should be handled and did not necessarily share Barack Obama’s vision on what the bill should look like. President Obama during one of his weekly addresses on July 18, 2009, said:

“…opponents of health reform warn that this is all some big plot for socialized medicine or government-run health care with long lines and rationed care. That's not true either. I don't believe that Government can or should run health care. But I also don't think insurance companies should have free reign to do as they please. That's why any plan I sign must include an insurance exchange, a one-stop shopping marketplace where you can compare the benefits, costs, and track records of a variety of plans, including a public option to increase competition and keep insurance companies honest, and choose what's best for your family” (Obama, 2009).

Obama used masculine political rhetoric defending his call for healthcare to the public. The President logical explained what he was thinking and was taking control of the situation by using singular first person only and what he is going to do with the power he has.

President Obama used a lot of his political capital fighting for Health Care reform. By constantly defending the bill and correcting misinformation given out to the public by critics, time was spent away from giving the public the positives about the bill allowing him to go on the
offensive. The Republicans used information from the Health Care reform bill and politically spun it to make it seem like a radical idea. The GOP at the time controlled the narrative on healthcare reform even though they were the minority party and could not stop it package from passing (Silverleib, 2010). The rhetoric used by Congressional Republican leadership drove conservative leaning individuals to display a strong dislike for any type of healthcare reform and for President Obama himself.

Even making the politically hard choices and trying to work with the Republicans in Congress, President Obama’s first two years in office were turbulent. The Republicans in Congress ended up derailing the first two years of Barack Obama’s time in office and created the Tea Party Movement. The number one goal of the Tea Party was to make President Obama a one-term President of the United States (Divided States Of America 2019). In 2010 after the midterms, Republicans gained over 60 seats in the House of Representatives and improved their numbers in the Senate, but not enough to retake the chamber (Harris and MacAskill, 2010).

The Back Cross of Budgeting

After the new Republican majority in House of Representatives took over, they changed their tactics against the Obama administration. The new Tea Party members in the GOP instead of acting like they wanted to work with President Obama on his legislative agenda became unapologetically hostile towards the President and his agenda, in their ideological opinion, for the sake of country because of their disapproval of Obama’s agenda. The House majority called for more Conservative leaning changes to the Federal government’s budget and policies. At the time Majority Leader Eric Cantor, Congressman Paul Ryan, and Kevin McCarthy were in the
Republican leadership in the House speaking on behalf of the new elected Tea Party members. They began forwarding their agenda and specifically opposing the priorities of the more traditional Republicans such as Speaker of the House John Boehner.

A big issue for the new Tea Party Republicans was the idea of Fiscal responsibility. Their ideology was that the Federal Government was too big, and it was unsustainable because it was unable to have a budget that didn’t drive up the deficit (*Divided States Of America* 2019). A usual part of any legislative session of Congress is a vote to raise the debt ceiling, so the Government can keep borrowing money to pay its bills. This piece of routine parliamentarian business did not go as smoothly as it usually has done in years past. The Tea Party members wanted spending cuts to the Federal budget by the Obama administration in exchange for raising the debt ceiling. President Obama was against cuts to the federal budget and fought with Republicans in the House to raise the debt ceiling without any concession from his administration. This became a standoff between the House Republicans and President Obama himself. Even though Speaker Boehner and President Obama had a deal in place called “The Grand Bargain”, a group of bipartisan Senators came together and came up with their own deal to raise the debt ceiling; with more options on the table, President Obama decided to get a bigger revenue increase with the “Grand Bargain” (*Divided States Of America* 2019). The original deal between the two leaders was an $800 billion dollars tax increase with over a trillion dollars of cuts in entitlement spending. Once President Obama was aware of this other deal by the Senators, he tried to use it as leverage against Speaker to raise the amount of revenue in the deal they had. He asked for an extra $400 billion in revenue on top of the amount agreed upon by the two men. Speaker Boehner, after consulting Majority Leader Eric Cantor, was convinced the
GOP members in the House only had the will to compromise with the President to get the bill passed as it was written. This led to negotiations falling apart and just two days before the US government would default on its debt, which then Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner made it clear to President Obama that the United States inability to borrow would be a bigger problem to the world economy than the possibility of US economy going into a depression three years prior (Divided States Of America 2019).

Before the United States could defaulted on the national debt, then-Vice President Joe Biden and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell came up with a temporary solution until the 2012 elections were over (Divided States Of America 2019). The deal allowed for the debt ceiling to be raised in exchange for the Democrats to create a plan to make some Federal budget cuts before a deadline. This new package would need to be approved by Congress before Spring of 2013 or it would trigger massive automatic cuts to the Federal budget that both Republicans and Democrats wanted to avoid.

The Congressional Republicans were willing to work with then-Vice-President Joe Biden on a deal was because they saw President Obama as vulnerable and substantially less popular than he was when running originally in 2008 (Divided States Of America 2019). This gave them hope that President Obama’s Republican opponent had a chance to beat him because of President Obama seemly unpopular domestic policy actions such as the overhaul of healthcare that sparked the visible Conservative backlash against him.

Before the 2012 General election was fully on the minds of voters and politicians and the deal with then Vice-President Joe Biden was struck with Senior Senator McConnell of Kentucky, President Obama was trying to work with Speaker of the House John Boehner on a “Grand
Bargain” on the debt ceiling that would satisfy the Tea Party members of the House and the Obama administration. This “Grand Bargain” that was being negotiated by Speaker of the House John Boehner and President Obama in secret (Abdullah, 2012). It would have included both cuts and additional revenue (taxes) added to the Federal budget. A deal between the two-party leaders almost happened but the talks were discouraged by the public and Republicans in the House. This ended up leading to more of the Republicans leadership who were more in tune with new Tea Party members to have greater involvement that ended up in a breakdown of negotiations (Divided States Of America 2019). Both President Obama and Speaker of the House John Boehner hoped the 2012 General election would solve this stalemate. This ended up not being the case because even though President Obama was able to win reelection; the Republicans in Congress stayed the majority party and added to their ranks in the Senate.

The Open Cross: Switching Partners?

President Obama launched his reelection campaign on April 4, 2011, with a different message than the one he used to get elected in 2008. His messages this time was centered around a stark choice for the future of America (Mason). Due to the level of conflict between the Obama White House and the Republican Majority in the House, President Obama’s poll numbers during this were at the lowest it had been during his Presidency, and he was coming to terms of what it meant being a polarizing figure in American politics (Divided States Of America 2019). He could no longer use the message that Americans were used to hearing from him on the campaign trail from 2008. Due to how the Republican caucus in Congress blocked his agenda, Obama changed his message and make this election less about uplifting the country and bringing
the two sides together to offering a clear distinction between himself and the eventual Republican nominee on what path they want the country to be on.

The eventual Republican nominee in 2012 was then-Former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney. Governor Romney was not a bold choice for the Presidency by the Republicans because he was still considered a very seasoned politician, and his views were very traditionally conservative compared to the upcoming politicians of the Tea Party Movement. He was not a very popular choice among the Tea Party enthusiasts because of his ties with the party establishment. Mitt Romney was also unable during the campaign to fully channel the anger the Tea Party had toward the political elite and how they were treated by Wall Street. Once Governor Romney became the 2012 nominee, he had to bring along and harness this anger pointed toward career politicians. In order to bolster enthusiasm for his campaign, excitement for his candidate and belief in his ideology, Romney chose Ways & Means Chairmen Paul Ryan as his running mate. Ryan’s ideology was more in line with the Tea Party members allowing for Governor Mitt Romney to bring along Tea Party members excited about his candidacy (Cowan, 2012).

Governor Mitt Romney framed his campaign about the failures of President Obama and allowed his Vice-Presidential nominee to be the part of the ticket that had the contradictory vision of the future he had for the country. During the campaign Romney critiqued President Obama for taking the country in the wrong direction. Governor Romney’s leadership style was different than President Obama. President Obama campaigned as not only the leader but the generator of ideas and the vision for America. The Democratic party was behind President Obama, supported his ideas, and saw the vision he was moving the country. Compared to the
Republican 2012 ticket, Governor Mitt Romney framed himself as the leader with vision on where he wants the country to go, while Representative Paul Ryan was framed as the person to create the blueprint for Romney’s vision for the country (Cowan, 2012). In the first Primary debate of 2012 for the Republican nomination Governor Romney stated,

“What needs to be done — there are really seven things that come to mind. One is to make sure our corporate tax rates are competitive with other nations. Number two is to make sure that our regulations and bureaucracy works not just for the bureaucrats in Washington, but for the businesses that are trying to grow. Number three is to have trade policies that work for us, not just for our opponents. Number four is to have an energy policy that gets us energy secure. Number five is to have the rule of law. Six, great institutions that build human capital, because capitalism is also about people, not just capital and physical goods. And number seven is to have a government that doesn't spend more money than it takes in. And I'll do it” (Romney, 2011).

Governor Romney uses traditional masculine rhetoric in this segment from the Primary debate to take the opportunity to show himself as a leader and lay his plans out logical to Republican voters.

Mitt Romney touted his experience from the private sector providing a traditional conservative viewpoint on what makes an economy strong. From the beginning, Romney’s rhetoric on where to take the country differed from President Obama. Governor Romney was trying to appear Presidential by using masculine political rhetoric in this statement by explaining his logical and using language to describe himself as the person who would implement it by saying at the end “I’ll do it”.
This comparison between the two separate partnerships between tickets made it easier for both sides to attack their respective opponent. Governor Romney was in a better position than his predecessor Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona on this front when it came to confronting President Obama’s eloquent language and clear analogies. Former Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney and Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona both dealt with an opponent with more charisma, President Obama. In order to combat Barack Obama’s inspirational rhetoric in Senator McCain bid and his passionate persuasion for reelection in Governor Romney bid, both nominees brought on a VP nominee to excite the base for their bid to add their own star power in the Presidential race. John McCain and Mitt Romney both lacked a very important quality that many modern Presidents had, which was charisma. It was for this reason that these Presidential candidates chose running mates to make up for their lack of it. In the 2008 General election for President then-Senator Obama was new to national politics and was able to clearly articulate his vision for the future for America. Governor Sarah Palin was able to do just that for the Senator John McCain’s Campaign. Palin was able to make conservative talking points sound exciting and a viable alternative to Obama’s vision. This was especially important during this election because of a very unpopular Republican President in office and the Republican party at a low point during this time national. In the Romney campaign in 2012 Congressman Paul Ryan was chosen for similar reasons to Governor Palin. Congressman Ryan allowed Governor Romney to energize the GOP base and provide a contrasting team and vision of America to the Obama/Biden ticket.

The difference between the Presidential races in 2008 and 2012 was the strength of the GOP message resonating with voters and President Obama becoming a relying cry for a return to
less progressive polices. Senior Senator McCain of Arizona could not make a strong argument with the public weary of Republican politicians because of the baggage of President Bush’s administration. Governor Romney had an electorate who wanted a conservative message to combat the progressive policies championed during Obama’s first term especially with Paul Ryan as the VP nominee on the ticket.

President Obama was fighting for his political life in a political environment where instead of harnessing the anger to propel his campaign forward in 2008 it was against him. During the Presidential debates during the general election campaign Governor Mitt Romney was able to take the fight to President Obama and his usual style was not going to work against him when Governor Romney strategy in the debate was to have President Obama defend his first term in office. Governor Romney attacked President Obama records on the deficit during the first debate and said:

“You said you’d cut the deficit in half. It's now 4 years later; we still have trillion-dollar deficits. The CBO says we'll have a trillion-dollar deficit each of the next 4 years. If you're reelected, we'll get to a trillion-dollar debt. But you have said before you'd cut the deficit in half. And this four—I love this idea of $4 trillion in cuts: You found $4 trillion of ways to reduce or to get closer to a balanced budget, except we still show trillion-dollar deficits every year. That doesn't get the job done” (Romney, 2012).

Romney again is using masculine political rhetoric by trying to hold Obama accountable for his time in office and what he feels is going wrong. This relates back to masculine political rhetoric used by authority figures. Romney tried (and almost did) dominant Obama and become an authority allowing him to gain credibility.
This line of attack directly appealed to Tea party and independent voters concerned about the deficit to show that President Obama failed in his ability to bridge the divide to create bipartisan solutions to solve problems the voters care about. The attack also framed Obama as irresponsible with taxpayers’ money. Governor Romney suggested that the middle class was not feeling the effects of all the billions being spent by the Obama administration and the liberal policies the President is championed during his term that don’t not make the lives of regular working-class Americans any better. Romney’s attack on Obama’s record on the deficit was also an example of masculine political rhetoric. Romney clearly and logically explains why he is attacking the President for failing to cut the deficit and his record on it allowing for an argument that Obama failed to lead on this issues, which attacks Obama’s alpha dog status. Governor Romney making traditional Republican talking points throwing the President off because of the style used in the delivery of these critiques of his time in office. President Obama did not defend his record on the deficit but tried to make Mitt Romney seem like he’s going to the extreme of one side of this issue. President Obama answered these attacks by saying “There has to be revenue in addition to cuts. Now, Governor Romney has ruled out revenue. He's ruled out revenue “(Obama, 2012). The addition of revenue to any part of approach to budget or deficit reduction negotiation has always been the President’s position was characterized not only by Governor Romney during the debate but other Republicans during his first term as “irresponsible” due to the slow economic growth (Romney, 2012). This is also another area during this debate President Obama did not defend his stance and allowed his opponent to control the narrative of the debate.
The first debate allowed Governor Romney to have taken a clear lead in the race because many felt watching it that Governor Romney seemed more confident and was able to get under President Obama skin making him look weak, and better able to handle the economy (Pew research editors, 2012). Governor Romney was able to accomplish this because President Obama was the driving force in his administration for ideas and policies. Comparatively for President Obama his opponent had already had a record from his time in Massachusetts, but since the President spent too much time defending his record and never used attacks on Mitt Romney that were effective on the campaign (Pew research editors, 2012).

The Obama 2012 campaign was in jeopardy of losing momentum and it was up to Vice-President Joe Biden to stop the Romney campaign from taking control of how this election was being framed. Vice-President Joe Biden was able to accomplish stopping the Romney campaign from controlling the final month of the election by being able to defend President Obama policies against Representative Paul Ryan in the only Vice-Presidential debate. Paul Ryan had a lot of baggage from his time being in the Majority in the House and the policies he proposed that were framed by the Obama campaign and Vice-President Joe Biden as unpopular and as an attack on the middle class. Congressmen Ryan attacked the Stimulus Package as wasteful and ineffective during the debate saying that the Obama administration said “if we just passed this stimulus, the economy would grow at 4 percent. It's growing at 1.3” (Ryan, 2012). He continued his line of attack continuing that it encouraged “Crony capitalism and corporate welfare” (Ryan, 2012). Vice-President Biden immediately forcefully defended it and made the statement that the Congressmen cannot defend because of previous statements attacking it. The Vice-President said,
I love that. I love that. This was such a bad program and he writes me a letter saying — writes the Department of Energy a letter saying, "The reason we need this stimulus, it will create growth and jobs." His words. And now he's sitting here looking at me And by the way, that program, again, investigated. What the Congress said was it was a model. Less than four-tenths of 1 percent waste or fraud in the program….Let me tell you what was a good idea. It was a good idea, Moody's and others said that this was exactly what we needed to stop this from going off the cliff. It set the conditions to be able to grow again. We have, in fact, 4 percent of those green jobs didn't go under — went under, didn't work. It's a better batting average than investment bankers have (Biden, 2012).

Representative Ryan was unable to defend this argument from the Vice-President because he used the money from the Stimulus Package for his own district to produce job growth. However, Vice-President Biden was unable to defend the slow economic growth, he was able to defend the attacks leveled against it by his opponent and make the public aware that Ryan who was against it took advantage of the package for his district. During the final two Presidential debates President Obama, changed his strategy and was better able to handle attacks from Governor Romney and defend his policies without his opponent getting under his skin (Haberman, 2012). President Obama no longer came at the debates from a calm cool demeanor and used more forceful language and did not let Mitt Romney control the narrative of the debate. Obama avoided defending his first term but focused intently on a potential second term, and he wanted to accomplish and vision he had to take the country.

At the end of the campaign, it was a true toss-up and both tickets could have ended up winning on November 6, 2012. President Obama won reelection with less support than he was
elected by the first time, and this was different than the historical trend of a President winning reelection (Divided States Of America 2019). Although President Obama won reelection, he did not win the argument to regain some of the seats lost in Congress from his historic lost in the 2010 midterms. By the end of the night the Republicans were still in power in the House of Representatives and gained more seats in Senate that eventually was able to win the majority in 2014.

Flamenco Dancing to the Audience

President Obama’s agenda had been stalled since the Republicans became the majority in the House of Representatives in 2010. The Democrats maintained control of the Senate allowing President Obama to exercise some pressure of the Republicans in Congress to. Also, since confirmations of appointments only needed Senate approval, President Obama could still keep approving judges and fill positions in his administration. This was not the case when Democrats lost the Senate to the Republicans in 2014 in the middle of President Obama’s second term (judis, 2012). The Republicans no longer had an incentive to work with the Obama administration.

The most well-known clash with the Republican caucus in the Senate was when Associate Justice Anthony Scalia unexpected passed away, in February 2016, allowing President Obama to nominate someone for the open seat on the Supreme Court. Then Majority Leader Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky announced he believed since it was so close to an election year, he would not schedule a vote on President Obama’s pick for the Supreme Court, Merrick Garland. Majority Leader Senator McConnell of Kentucky was betting on a Republican
winning the Presidency after President Obama left office allowing to keep the conservative leaning majority on the court.

President Obama after years with trying to work with the Republicans in Congress, virtually stopped completely trying and turned to what he was in control of as the President of the United States. He decided that he would use his Executive authority powers to further his agenda if he could not get through Congress (Divided States Of America 2019). President Obama’s executive action angered Republicans on Capitol Hill because they felt it was unconstitutional, and that it was an overreach of the powers the President holds.

While President Obama increased his powers and stretched the limit of the President’s policy making abilities, the Republicans in the House of Representatives were not satisfied with how their leadership was running the Caucus. Then Majority Leader Representative Eric Cantor lost his bid for reelection in 2014 to a Tea Party challenger even though he was one of the most in tune members of leadership with the movement. Speaker of the House John Boehner also decided not to run for reelection and avoid a primary challenge because of his willingness to work with the Obama administration and slowly losing control of his caucus. When it came time to elect a new Speaker of the House for the new upcoming Congress, Speaker Boehner asked Congressman Paul Ryan of Wisconsin, who was the Vice-Presidential nominee in 2012, to run (LoGiurato, 2015). Representative Paul Ryan ideologically had very popular ideas with the caucus on how to fundamentally change the size of the Federal government including popular entitlement programs.

Speaker of the House Paul Ryan had an easier time controlling the Republican members of the House then his predecessor John Boehner. Speaker Ryan’s ideology was more closely in
line with the new members of House of Representative from the Tea Party, than Speaker Boehner who had a traditional Republican ideology. The rhetoric used by conservative talk radio hosts that was fueling the more extreme wings of the Republican party had attacked Speaker Boehner’s ability to run the caucus effectively and that his status as a political insider made him not conservative enough to take on President Obama and make extremely dangerous choices in order to force fiscal conservative policy changes to the Federal Government (*Divided States Of America* 2019).

**Better to Dance Flamenco Than a Tengo**

President Obama was elected with the mandate to change Washington and how America worked fundamentally. As the first black President, Obama had a lot on his shoulders because of his very existence (*Divided States Of America* 2019). President Obama fundamentally transformed what a President of the United States could look like. As much as President Obama during his first campaign inspired hope and change, his potential to influence the country in one direction for a generation freighted his ideological opposites just as much. With fear of losing the cultural wars the Republicans made it their mission during his Presidency to stop him from delivering on his promises to the record number of voters who put him into office (*Divided States Of America* 2019).

President Obama’s first two years legislatively is what he will be remembered for. Laws such as the Affordable Care Act, Dodd-Frank Financial Regulation Package, and American Recovery Act are President Obama’s biggest accomplishment from a policy standpoint because he had a Congress willing to work with him. After losing the majority in the House of
Representative, Obama was not able to get anything substantive through essentially making him unable to move on his progressive ideas. President Obama decided to stop working with the Republicans after his optimism was lost from being repeatedly bombarded with critiques from Right-wing talk radio and the obstructive strategies used by Republicans in Congress to stop his agenda. President Obama decided during his second term with not being on the ballot to move forward on issues he deemed important without the Congress that by the middle of his second term was completely controlled by the opposite party.

President Obama was a symbol of hope and change to his supporters, and his election many felt was proof of America’s progress on race and its commitment to continue to getting better on social issues. The President’s agenda and ideology became a rallying cry for conservatives to stop this President and all he stood for. The President was elected on a mandate of looking for ways to bridge the divide in Congress and bring to parties together for the sake of the country made it more difficult on President Obama to act unilaterally even though he had the numbers in the House and Senate to pass legislation the first two years in office. Every time he failed to find bipartisan ground to bring the parties together it was a political defeat because of the promises he made to the American people during his original run for the White House in 2008. The eight years of the Obama Presidency were a time of hyper partisanship and a country increasing divided on where to take the country. Once President Obama was no longer on the ballot as a politician, his legislative and political legacies is what made the 2016 election one of the most important in a generation because it decided how far is the United States willing to take progressive ideologies after President Obama was gone or how many felt betrayed by the Obama administration and did not recognize the country that was in front of them.
Barack Obama’s time in office left a bigger right in the American socially than when they came together to elect him. Parts of Obama’s coalition felt like the President failed him and was looking for something different in the 2016 campaign. Obama became part of the establishment in eyes of many and people begun wanting to look for something anti-Obama. The hope and change President Obama promised many felt did not come or did not benefit from it at all. The GOP were not only gaining more support from the American people because they feel the Democrats had failed them, they felt they did not recognize the country that was in front of them. The country feeling this way at the end of Obama second term was again looking for change but not the change the current President promised to bring. With the-Junior Senator Hillary Clinton has the de facto nominee at the point, the GOP wanted to nominate a person who is everything former Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama were not.
Chapter 4: The Reverse Paso Doble to the Presidency

Stalking the Pray

Starting in 2008 with the nomination of Alaska Governor Sarah Palin as the Vice-Presidential nominee for the Republican ticket and the nomination of then-Junior Senator Barack Obama of Illinois as the Presidential nominee for the Democratic party, the country’s discourse had escalated tensions because of these decisions. The-Junior Senator Obama of Illinois both having a middle name associated with a major Islamic terrorist and the prospect of having the first black President made some of the electorate feel uneasy. Obama was a young new face in national politics who defeated a Democratic party establishment candidate. Governor Palin was herself just like Barack Obama was a fresh face to national politics but did not act like a typical politician. Palin spoke like a person from the working class and explained policy in laymen’s terms using a populist conservative message. Overall, her new way of appealing to voters made the 2008 General election controversial. However, Sarah Palin made the electorate ask the question of what experiences qualify someone to be President, and many voters thought she wasn’t qualified (Cooper & Sussman, 2008). Palin was still in her first term as Governor of Alaska and was a two-term small town Mayor before that. Many found her not qualified to be President after a disastrous interview with CBS anchor Katie Couric, which would see Palin with the most amount of negative coverage of the campaign for her (Pew Research Center Editors, 2008). This question of how qualified a person needs to be did not come up again until Donald Trump ran for President in 2016 in a crowded field of Republican hopefuls.
Donald Trump and Governor Sarah Palin had the same following in the Republican party. The Trump campaign was often distrustful of the media and government agencies on the issues. Trump based his claims on why he would make a good President because on his billionaire status and extensive background in business. Donald Trump was a paradoxical phenomenon because he was able to attract the working class to his campaign; even though they detested the upper classes which he is a part of. Trump was able to reach this important group in American politics and make them forget he is the type of person they feel are making their lives miserable by articulating their plight and provides answer to it.

Trump’s self-proclaimed role as a non-politician was turned into a strength, and he regularly touted it during his campaign rallies and debates. During the campaign, many scandals that most politicians would not be able to come back from did not seem to lose Mr. Trump’s supporters. Donald Trump’s experience as a reality TV star and a businessman made the way he spoke on the stump and the debates not polished compared to seasoned politicians. In a speech in Milwaukee, Wisconsin Donald Trump said,

“The Democratic Party has taken the votes of African-Americans for granted. They’ve just assumed they’ll get your support and done nothing in return for it. It’s time to give the Democrats some competition for these votes, and it’s time to rebuild the inner cities of America – and to reject the failed leadership of a rigged political system” (Trump, 2016).

This campaign pitch to black voters was traditional way to target a demographic by explain and telling what the other party or opponent are not doing for the segment using masculine political rhetoric. Trump was telling black voters and try to explain it logically. Donald Trump campaigning to the black community also continued his use of conversational speech tone to
connect with parts of this important group in the Democratic party’s general coalition. He is using his experience as a reality TV star to create connections with audience members that usually other Republicans candidates do not court. To be a reality TV star a person needs to be likeable and have charm. Donald Trump used his natural charm and charisma to court black voters in Milwaukee that usually are not on his party’s political radar. Donald Trump as a self-proclaimed outsider can claim the political system is corrupt and rigged because this is his first bid for higher office compared to Secretary Clinton who has been in the public eye for over 2 decades. This made his rhetoric more brash, controversial and ended up flustering his opponents. During a debate in the beginning of the 2016 Republican primary in California an example of brash rhetoric used to fluster an opponent was he attack against Junior Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky before answering a question about his temperament. He said, "Well, first of all, Rand Paul shouldn't even be on this stage. He's number 11, he's got 1 percent in the polls, and how he got up here, there's far too many people anyway. As far as temperament — and we all know that — as far as temperament, I think I have a great temperament. I built a phenomenal business with incredible, iconic assets, one of the really truly great real-estate businesses. And I may be an entertainer, because I've had tremendous success with number-one bestsellers all over the place, with "The Apprentice" and everything else I've done” (Trump, 2015).

Donald Trump attacked Sen. Rand Paul as a power play to show his weakness as a candidate and to remind the audience that he is leading in polls. Trump by making the comment that there was too many people on the stage, he wanted to make the other Republican candidates feel small and vulnerable because of how well he was doing in the polls. While making that
point, he defends his temperament and highlighted his experience in the private sector. The reason Donald Trump was able not to damage himself politically and allow him to win the Presidency ultimately was his authentic, hypermasculine, unapologetic persona he constructed, and the fact that he is a man running against a woman (Katz, 2016). This attack against Junior Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky was also an example of Donald Trump using hypermasculine rhetoric to overpower and control the narrative in the campaign. Not only did Trump have a logical argument for what he said against the Senator but never allowed Rand Paul to formulate a cohesive argument to counter Trump’s attack. Donald Trump’s inability to admit fault in any situation was a great asset to him running against his opponents in the primary and general elections. Having an alpha male mentality allowed him to look strong, sure of himself, and authentic. Compared to his chief rival, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, during the 2016 election, who also had tough guy persona, which rhetorical shown how she was going to act as President on day one, and how unbelievable a Donald Trump Presidency would be. Former Secretary of State Clinton continually admitted her mistakes, which in most cases would score her political points, but it only gave her critics more evidence that made view of her being inauthentic more credible.

As Dr. Katz describes, it is important as the President and a leader to not look overly emotionally and always seem sure of oneself. Businessman Donald Trump was skillful and played up these qualities about himself. These two attributes allowed Businessman Donald Trump to use demagogic rhetoric in the primary and general elections to gain supporters and position himself as a legitimate challenger to better funded and more experienced candidates like former Secretary of Clinton Hillary Clinton and the other Republican challengers. This chapter
will use Mr. Trump’s announcement speech, primary and general election debates from 2016, and his inaugural address to capture his messaging throughout the entire 2016 Presidential campaign up to his first day in office.

**Enticing and Separating the Matadors**

Donald Trump, on June 16, 2015, at Trump Tower, announced his intention to run for President. He used rhetoric that was designed to make the parts of the electorate afraid and angry. Mr. Trump, at the beginning of his announcement, made the claim that China, Japan, and Mexico are taking advantage of the United States and how they are doing it. The most famous claim was how he thought Mexico was taking advantage of the United States. He said,

“The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems. [applause] Thank you. It's true, and these are the best and the finest. When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. They're not sending you. They're sending people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with them. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists” (Trump, 2015).

This type of rhetoric made an appeal to the audience’s emotions and used masculine political rhetoric to enhance the argument to make him sound Presidential. Donald Trump was not only trying to create a rift between his supporters and immigrants, but he also accused them of causing serious problems in America, such as crime or drug trafficking. Donald Trump claimed that the “U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else’s problems” (Trump, 2015), infers that the problems facing America were not created domestically but internationally caused by relations with other countries. What made this statement an example of masculine rhetoric
was that it was impersonal and used in organized pattern that seemed logical. Trump blamed politicians in general for economic and foreign relational setbacks the country suffered (Trump, 2015) and continues explaining to the audience that America needs to be made great again, which he can do. Donald Trump claims the reason the politicians are bad at their job and America is not great anymore is because of lobbyists, donors, and special interest groups. He said,

“so I've watched the politicians. I've dealt with them all my life. If you can't make a good deal with a politician, then there's something wrong with you. You're certainly not very good. And that's what we have representing us. They will never make America great again. They don't even have a chance. They're controlled fully — they're controlled fully by the lobbyists, by the donors, and by the special interests, fully” (Trump, 2015).

Donald Trump took the natural mistrust the electorate has for career politician and turning it to his advantage. He positioned himself as a non-political outsider of the political establishment and claimed to have the knowledge of why the people they send to Washington to fix their problems for them are not getting it done. This statement again is another example of masculine rhetoric from Trump to his audience. Trump is inserting himself as the leader and giving his opinion on what is right and wrong. Trump is also making a logical argument about how the voters already feel about politicians and using it to his advantage.

One of Trump’s greatest appeals as a candidate is that he was not part of the political establishment. He very often used rhetoric to remind voters that all of his opponents are career
politicians, which makes him different from them and attack Obama-era policies at the same time. During Donald Trump’s first debate with Secretary Clinton, he said,

“And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving, they're gone. And, Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions” (Trump, 2016).

He made these remarks in the Presidential Campaign debate when asked how he would bring back jobs because he wanted to tap into the American voter’s distrust of career politicians. Mr. Trump wanted to make it seem that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton never really cared about the public during her political career, while his skills as a businessman made him qualified to fix the issues of jobs because he knows already how to create them (Trump, 2016). This attack on Secretary of State Clinton, Businessman Donald Trump using hypermasculine rhetoric to dominate former Secretary of State Clinton in the debate by using organized, logical sounding arguments and not allowing her to come up with counterargument by either continuing his assault or changing subjects. Mr. Trump continued his verbal attack on former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and said, “Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn't work. Never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like former Secretary of State Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what's going on” (Trump, 2016). During this debate and the other two that followed it, Mr. Trump wanted to be painted as a successful businessman whose private sector success makes him better equipped to handle problems in America, such as the economy, because of his outsider political status.
Trump also strategically makes the case that former Secretary of State Clinton has been in power for too long and has constantly made bad decisions throughout her political career, making her unqualified to be President. Mr. Trump wanted to make former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton seem out of touch, but President Obama as well. During his acceptance speech of the Republican nomination for President in Cleveland, Ohio, in 2016, Mr. Trump spoke about a girl who got shot by an illegal immigrant. Mr. Trump said,

“She was 21 years-old, and was killed the day after graduating from college with a 4.0 Grade Point Average. Number one in her class. Her killer was then released a second time, and he is now a fugitive from the law. I've met Sarah's beautiful family. But to this Administration, their amazing daughter was just one more American life that wasn't worth protecting. No more. One more child to sacrifice on the order and on the altar of open borders. What about our economy?” (Trump, 2016).

The statement above was meant to make the Obama administration seem to have a relaxed view on crime and illegal immigration while making Mr. Trump seem compassionate to working people lives being made worse by the problems at the border. The economy plays a role in making Mr. Trump seem more compassionate because the lower and working class feel that immigrants are taking away their jobs. Donald Trump is speaking to two issues at the same time. The security and the wellbeing of the American people, in Trump opinion, is being put in jeopardy by the illegal immigrants coming from south of the border and speaks to these families how they are going to be protected but also the myth of immigrants stealing jobs from American working-class people. This message was one of Donald Trump’s big policy changes he touted to the electorate while running (Trump, 2016).
Mr. Trump campaigned that President Obama failed in his campaign promise to bring change to Washington. Trump’s ability to connect with his voters and to be able to make them produce such strong emotions showing the support they had for him showed how effective his rhetoric was compared to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, whose supporters did not share the same enthusiasm for her candidacy as Mr. Trump’s (Wasike, 2019). Former Secretary of State Clinton was always a polarizing figure in the Democratic party but also in politics generally, which put her at a disadvantage from the beginning of her second run for the Presidency in 2016 because many Americans already knew her and had an opinion about her as well her being a woman. Many felt former Secretary of State Clinton was inauthentic and gave answer that were too prepared, which was on purpose due to her over 20-year experience in the public eye, but it was not supposed to be taken in negative way (Greenberg, 2015). During the entire election, she acted like she would have if she was already President. She wanted to show the voters that on day one as President, she would not need any on the job training because she trained for this her whole life.

Former Secretary of State Clinton was not a typical all-American woman and she could not have been to have gained the respect of those around her. She did not stay home and become a homemaker, nor did she allow her husband to be the breadwinner of the house. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton did not have the feminine charisma as, for example, the last woman on a major party ticker former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin. It was indigent of former Secretary of State Clinton strength becoming a major political figure that she is today but due to her more progressive values and persona it hurt her with more traditional voters. Former Secretary of State Clinton’s weakness as a woman comes from the strength, she had to show to
become an important political power player, she was unable to take the safe rout or live by traditional gender roles. Her weakness made Businessman Donald Trump hypermasculinity in the race more effective than it would be against a male opponent and gave more of an advantage with older more traditional voters who had rigged views of gender roles.

Businessman Donald Trump repeatedly attacked the mainstream news media during his 2016 campaign. The media is usually the institution that controls the public perception of candidates. Mr. Trump combative relationship with the media was a tactic to divide the electorate to make him seem more credible. Businessman Trump knew that the more he continued to be on bad terms with the media the more pressure he could assert allowing him to dominate the air waves. By defending himself and not taking any responsibility for the accusations the media was leveling against him, Businessman Trump made his supporters distrustful of the media when they did not agree with him, because he was able to put a political spin on it that the media was directly attacking him to keep him from winning the Presidency.

Businessman Donald Trump, due to his distrust of the mainstream media, made use of the social media platform Twitter to directly communicate with his supporters. This type of communication Mr. Donald Trump kept even after the campaign was over and used it throughout his time in the White House. During the first Republican debate of the 2016 election in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Trump was asked to defend and provide evidence for an earlier statement regarding Mexican immigrants. He took the opportunity to attack the moderators and other journalists instead of answering the question. He said,

“if it weren't for me, you wouldn't even be talking about illegal immigration, Chris [Wallace, Fox News]. You wouldn't even be talking about it. [applause] This was not a subject
that was on anybody’s mind until I brought it up at my announcement. And I said, Mexico is sending. Except the reporters, because they’re a very dishonest lot, generally speaking, in the world of politics, they didn't cover my statement the way I said it” (Trump, 2015).

Businessman Donald Trump, in this rebuttal to the question asked by the moderator, never addressed the question asked but also raised doubts and strongly suggested that there was a lack of honesty in the media.

Businessman Donald Trump offered his supporters substantial change from the Obama administration in both domestic and foreign policy. Mr. Trump’s policies were grounded in the concept of “America First”. Mr. Trump used his knowledge as a businessman to speak to the anger felt by segments of the electorate. America First policies included not intervening in other countries’ affairs unless it made America safer, or a direct change of course from trade policies either being considered or signed by past presidents to bring unskilled labor jobs back theoretically, and lower taxes on the middle class and small businesses (Trump, 2016). The policy claim made by Mr. Trump’s “America First” policy puts the American people in a category by themselves and encourages isolation from the greater global community. This policy helped form a perception that the greater global community as a whole cannot be trusted because of the lack of association with them. Donald Trump argues that other countries “dump” their problems on the United States and he specifically speaks of drugs, crime, and theft of economic sources (Trump, 2015) to make those in the electorate scared or angry. He then made voters feel safe because he had a plan to deal with these problems that are claimed to be caused by outside forces; he created his “American First” policy to show the voters he not only knew what the problem was but how he was going to solve it for them. This “American First” policy was not
only popular with the Republican base, but with disgruntled Democrat Bernie Sanders’ supporters (Trump, 2016). In his victory speech, when he reached above the delegate count to clinch the Republican nomination, he directly appealed to Bernie Sanders’ supporters and mentioned that on trade Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont and himself had similar views on policy (Trump, 2016).

Taking the Bate

Businessman Donald Trump, during the 2016 election, repeatedly used rhetoric to attack his primary and general election opponents. When he was attacked during a debate or a new scandal broke out, he could spin the conversation and highlight faults in his opponents instead of himself. This tactic did not completely stop the conversation or media coverage of the topic, but it did take some of the pressure off him to answer questions and provided a distraction. This combination was effective to make what his opponent did more relevant to the voters or the national security of the United States compared to his multiple scandals allowing him to not be politically hurt by them.

Mr. Trump, for example, was often pressed to release his tax returns by former Secretary of State Clinton and by moderators of the primary and general election debates. Mr. Trump took these opportunities to talk about former Secretary of State Clinton’s private email server (Trump, 2016). He bluntly presented the audience with a dramatic choice between the lesser of two evils. The fact that he has not released his tax returns, which all other Presidential candidates had done for over 40 years, could suggest he has something to hide. He further compared this to the fact
that former Secretary of State Clinton used a private email server while working at the State Department.

Businessman Donald Trump, a first-time candidate for any office, ran a campaign different than his primary opponents. His opponents were cast as career politicians while he ran as an outsider. His complete lack of political experience led his opponents to underestimate his rhetorical argument and popular appeal with the conservative base. Governor Jeb Bush called Mr. Trump “un-hinged” for his Muslim ban. Mr. Trump, during a debate, responded,

“Jeb doesn't really believe I'm unhinged. He said that very simply because he has failed in this campaign. It's been a total disaster. Nobody cares. And frankly, I'm the most solid person up here. I built a tremendous company, and all I want to do is make America great again. I don't want our country to be taken away from us, and that's what's happening. The policies that we've suffered under other presidents have been a disaster for our country. We want to make America great again. And Jeb, in all fairness, he doesn't believe that (Trump, 2015).

Mr. Trump in debate used hypermasculine rhetoric to dominate former Governor of Florida Jeb Bush when he attacked Businessman Trump on his temperament. After this an exchange happen between the two candidates resulting in Trump dominating the exchange and not allowing for Former Governor of Florida Jeb Bush to create a respond to Mr. Trump’s claims. Businessman Trump’s call for a Muslim ban was seen as a racist policy, which many of his primary opponents and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton attacked him on. Businessman Trump avoid answering the question if he was on “unhinged” and redirected the conversation to Former Governor of Florida Jeb Bush’s underperforming campaign. Former Governor of Florida Jeb
Bush was considered the frontrunner before the 2016 campaign started because his ability to attract independent voters with a proven track as winning the former Governor of the swing state of Florida and a last name associated with two former Presidents (Peoples, 2014).

During the Republican nomination process, Mr. Trump was not well-liked by the other candidates. He attacked them and put them on the defensive because of the unorthodox style of attacks he used. For example, Mr. Donald Trump repeatedly attacked former President George W. Bush and the other members of the Bush family in front of former Governor of Florida Jeb Bush (Trump, 2016). This was unusual because attacking past Presidents of the same party was an unspoken rule. This was a risk taken by Trump because not only was former President George W. Bush, the last Republican President, but he was also deeply unpopular. By mentioning former President George W. Bush this reminded voters why they voted the party out of power by wide margins allowing for super majorities by the Democrats in the House and Senate. Businessman Trump repeatedly claimed that former President George W. Bush made a mistake going into Iraq and tied that argument to him being the most competent person in the primary running because of opposition to the Iraq war (Trump, 2016). He suggested that it was a Republican President who got the United States in a deeply unpopular war that was still going on in Afghanistan. This claim risked alienating independent voters. Many of Mr. Trump’s primary opponents came to the defensive of former President George W. Bush and the decision to go into Iraq, although that decision was one of the reason former President George W. Bush’s poll numbers dropped so low other than the economy (Pew Research Center, 2008). Mr. Trump’s attacks on the former President Bush paid off and produced, an emotional response from the campaign audience. Mr. Trump said, “How did he keep us safe when the World Trade Center — the World — excuse me.
I lost hundreds of friends. The World Trade Center came down during the reign of George Bush. He kept us safe? That is not safe” (Trump, 2016). This not only put his opponents on the defensive but made it, so he could sidestep then argue and avoid answering any specific policy questions.

Piercing the Capes

Businessman Donald Trump, during the 2016 campaign, positioned himself as the law-and-order candidate. He showed his toughness compared to the other Republican candidates by repeatedly insulting them and acting aggressively during debates and campaign rallies. His blunt, hypermasculine masculine style demonstrated that his opponents looked weak and showed his dominance over them, making him seem stronger and in charge. Dr. Jackson Katz compares presidential campaigns and the election process of men trying to prove to the electorate that they are the manliest out of the group; therefore, the best candidate to be President (Katz, 2016). Mr. Donald Trump exhibited behaviors that were meant to overpower his competitors and make them look weak and make himself appear tougher and more masculine than his opponents.

Businessman Donald Trump used the same tactics with male opponents during the Primary election with former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during the General election. Mr. Trump, during the general election, became more hypermasculine against former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton masculinity. Businessman Donald Trump’s hypermasculinity as a candidate was more intense against former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton due to her historical position as the first woman to be nominated for President by a major political party. Mr. Trump had a track record of not treating women with the same respect as a man. Former Secretary of State
Clinton, as a woman running for an office that has been held by exclusively men, was a challenge to the status quo. Mr. Donald Trump’s masculinity was not only upfront in his campaign but was strongly embraced during both the primary and general elections to beat back his opponents. This behavior was seen during the debates with the other opponents including how he mocked former Secretary of Clinton Hillary Clinton during the general election, and the way he handled scandals that either involved or mentioned women.

On October 7, 2016, actually one month before the General election, a video recording of Mr. Trump describing sexual assaulting woman was released days before the town hall Presidential debate between former Secretary of State Clinton and himself. Mr. Trump, during the debate, apologized for the comments on the tape that what he said he felt were inappropriate, apologized to his family, and that he comments he made were “locker room talk” (2016). Although some considered the tape a political debacle, the Hollywood Access episode made Mr. Trump look more authentic and a perfect foil to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s feminist stance during the campaign. Former Secretary of State Clinton stated that

“what we all saw and heard on Friday was Donald talking about women, what he thinks about women, what he does to women. And he has said that the video doesn't represent who he is. But I think it's clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. Because we've seen this throughout the campaign (2016).

This is an example of former Secretary of State Clinton using hyperfeminine rhetoric to attack Donald Trump and telling them not to vote for him because of him sexually assaulting woman. During the second debate Donald Trump responded to the moderator Anderson Cooper of CNN question about what language he would call it he said “… called what you said locker room
banter. You described kissing women without consent, grabbing their genitals. That is sexual
assault. You bragged that you have sexually assaulted women. Do you understand that” (Cooper,
2016) and says “No, I didn't say that at all. I don't think you understood what was—this was
locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I apologize to my family. I apologize to the American
people. Certainly I'm not proud of it. But this is locker room talk” (Trump, 2016). Trump during
this exchange attempted to dominate the moderator using hypermasculine rhetoric. This scandal
was a defining moment in the campaign and made those who were still unsure about wanting to
vote for Donald Trump make their decision easier (Neville-Shepard, 2021). Supporters accepted
the excuse of “locker room talk” legitimized that it was acceptable for Mr. Trump to be
discussing women in such a manner regardless of if he did or wanted to act on the words he says
in the video. Businessman Donald Trump’s excuse of locker room references demonstrated his
toxic masculinity at play as well. Trump’s lewd depiction of and crude joking about sexual
assault revealed how much he did not respects’ women in general. It further demonstrated that
Mr. Trump sought to act normal everyday occurrence in the United States and his words were
meaningless. During the town hall debate in 2016, Businessman Donald Trump showed his more
authoritative masculine side against Hillary Clinton. He was usually the one displaying
dominance during the debates. Mr. Trump continually interrupted former Secretary of State
Clinton and was continually “verbally sparing” with the female moderator Martha Raddatz of
ABC News (Presidency Project editors, 2016).

During the townhall debate, Mr. Donald Trump repeatedly interrupted former Secretary
of State Hillary Clinton during times it was her turn to speak. These attacks were not substantive
policy differences between them but personal attacks on her character and her effectiveness as a politician. Mr. Trump as an example said during the debate that,

“She complains that Donald Trump took advantage of the tax code. Well, why didn't she change it? Why didn't you change it when you were a senator? The reason you didn't is that all your friends take the same advantage that I do. And I do. You have provisions in the tax code that, frankly, we could change. But you wouldn't change it, because all of these people gave you the money so you can take negative ads on Donald Trump. But—and I say that about a lot of things. You know, I've heard Hillary complaining about so many different things over the years. "I wish you would have done this." But she's been there for 30 years she's been doing this stuff. She never changed. And she never will change. She never will change” (Trump, 2016).

At this point in the town hall debate Mr. Trump used hypermasculine rhetoric to attack Former Secretary of State Clinton’s record as a politician. Regardless, if what Trump was saying was true or not it sounded well thought out, logical, and continually controlled the ideas allowed to be used in the exchange between the nominees. Mr. Trump made the claim that when she was a Senator and has been in the public eye for 30 years but does not acknowledge that former Secretary of State Clinton was a First Lady of Arkansas and the United States during the beginning of her political career. These are ceremonial positions that are not directly involved in making policy changes. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton did although work with congress on her pet projects on less polarizing issues that succeeded and was unsuccessful when she pressed congress to take up Healthcare reform. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in her political position did not have the ability to act unilaterally to alter the law making his attacks on her misleading and were only used to create a negative image of the mind of the voters about
her. Not only was this about creating more negative opinions about her, but it was also about making her seem incompetent or ineffective as a politician. Mr. Donald Trump’s consistent interruptions were not only device he used to “put her in her place”, but he throughout the debate also went into her personal space to show the size different between the two of them to show how much taller and menacing he looked compared to her when looking at them at certain camera angels (Jamieson, 2016).

**On to the Next Challenger**

During President Donald Trump inaugural address, he said “today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, DC, and giving it back to you, the people” (Trump, 2017). President Donald Trump was correct that the day marked when a transfer of power happened and power was given back to the people, but he never described what kind of people power was being given to. The progressive ideologies and future sought by President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Former Secretary of State Clinton lost not because more people disagreed with her, but by how the Electoral College counts votes. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton won almost 3 million more votes than President Donald Trump in the popular vote but lost by significant margins in the electoral college electing Donald Trump President.

The newly inaugurated President presented in his speech a new image of a future where “a new vision will govern our land. From this day forward, it's going to be only America first. America first. Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made
to benefit American workers and American families.” (Trump, 2017). The United States would begin a time that looking at the greater picture was not the priority of the United States anymore. That the United States, in his opinion, has been,

“for many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nations' borders while refusing to defend our own and spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay” (Trump, 2017).

President Donald Trump believed he had a mandate by being elected to take all he has viewed as poor decisions done by the politicians in general and use his skills as businessman and television reality TV star. January 20, 2017, started the turbulent years of the Trump administration that made the wounds left after 2016 only far worse for when President Donald Trump was up for reelection.
Chapter 5: The One Without a Dance

The Viennese Waltz of Tradition

“…Human rights are women's rights and women's rights are human rights..” (Clinton, 1995) was spoken by a very powerful woman who at the time was in a ceremonial and traditional role as spouse of a head of state. This woman, who was the First Lady of the United States at the time, spoke these words because of how she was being treated at home and where this speech was being held. The speech was given in Beijing, China at the 4th World Conference on Women. She understood that for many years in Chinese culture, women were devalued or even aborted to have a chance a male child because it was economically better for a family to have a son. This was also a very defining moment in her life as well with relentless attacks back home in the United States. This quote also describes what it meant to be First Lady in the 21st century on how to further feminist causes using her bully pulpit. She not only used her bully pulpit for these issues but she spoke out on many issues in tandem with her husband and made a name for herself in her own right. She became a distant voice of her own instead of being an extension of her husband. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, like many women whose husbands carried the role of head of state, ran for public office once their husband was no longer in power. The difference between former Secretary of State Hillary and others is she did not make her husband a reason for her to gain power, but the experience of her own contributions to her husband’s government was what made her qualified for public office. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton fought for the progression of women in the male dominant spaces. The ideology that
made former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton such an inspiring figure also was her greatest weakness as a figure in modern American politics. In this chapter, the artifacts that show these inspiring and damaging traits are her Presidential announcement speeches from 2008 and 2016 and her Presidential debates in 2008 and 2016.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton as First Lady of Arkansas and the United States was always a popularizing figure for the electorate. This arguably stemmed from her being the most accomplished between her and her husband. She was a very threatening figure to those who wanted to keep the status quo and keep successful, powerful women in the United States in a less societal importance than men. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was top of her class at Yale Law school ahead of her husband, and during former President Bill Clinton’s time as Governor, she made more money than him as the managing partner in the Rose Law Firm (Keith, 2015). Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, in her own words, feels she has been misunderstood by the public. During former President Bill Clinton’s first campaign for the White House, she said, "You know, I suppose I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas, but what I decided to do was to fulfill my profession, which I was in before my husband was in public life," (Clinton, 1992). Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was a woman who wanted it all. She wanted a family and professional fulfillment, and her statement was seen as an attack on women who did not choose to have a professional life and choose to instead raise a family. This negative view of her lasted throughout her entire political career.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was the first woman in American history whose Presidential campaign was not seen as symbolic (GutGold, 2009). Many women ran for President before Hillary Clinton. Junior Senator of North Carolina Elizabeth Dole and
Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, for example, were some of the few women before Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton when she ran for President in 2008. What was different was that Hillary Clinton was the frontrunner for the nomination of her party, which is something that other women never had. Former Secretary of State Clinton did not have to struggle to be taken seriously. She was the person to beat in the race. This was true in both the 2008 election and the 2016 election. What was also the same in both races was the basic rhetorical arguments she used against her fellow Democrat, then-Senator of Illinois Barack Obama in 2008 and the Republican nominee Businessman Donald Trump in 2016.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said during her 2016 Presidential campaign announcement address that “..America’s basic bargain. [is] If you do your part you ought to be able to get ahead. And when everybody does their part, America gets ahead too. That bargain inspired generations of families, including my own” (Clinton, 2015), which sounds similar to her web announcement she made in 2008 announcement of her candidacy when she said, “Whether it was fighting for women's basic rights or childrens' basic health care. Protecting our Social Security, or protecting our soldiers. It's a kind of basic bargain, and we've got to keep up our end. So let's talk. Let's chat. Let's start a dialogue about your ideas and mine” (Clinton, 2007). These are examples of Former Secretary of State Clinton using hyperfeminine political rhetoric by referring to her experiences with the American dream, bringing woman’s issues to forefront of the political issues during a campaign and using an authoritative tone suggesting more of a command than a suggestion. What changed was not how Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton campaigned or approached her audience, but how she decided to present her message to the electorate. Hillary Clinton, in 2008, decided to use a more feminine intimate approach by
using her home as the space to launch her campaign. She begins her campaign announcement video saying, “I'm not just starting a campaign, though, I'm beginning a conversation -- with you, with America. Because we all need to be part of the discussion if we're all going to be part of the solution. And all of us have to be part of the solution” (Clinton, 2007) and ending it with “And while I can't visit everyone's living room, I can try. And with a little help from modern technology, I'll be holding live online video chats this week…” (Clinton, 2007). Both of these statements from her announcement video are further examples of her using feminine rhetoric to appeal to voters. Former Secretary of State Clinton is “having a conversation” with America, which the video showed her in a traditional maternal environment on the couch with pictures of her family surrounding her, and her web announcement does not mention her husband, President Bill Clinton. This imaging and messaging she uses were made to imitate and be genuine. This plays into the strength of traditional forms of femininity.

Comparatively, former Secretary of State Clinton decided to go for the more traditionally masculine way and have a big rally in front of the United Nations building in New York to announce her addition to the race for the White House. Former Secretary of State Clinton said, “To be here in this beautiful park dedicated to Franklin Roosevelt’s enduring vision of America, the nation we want to be. And in a place… with absolutely no ceilings. You know, President Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms are a testament to our nation’s unmatched aspirations and a reminder of our unfinished work at home and abroad. His legacy lifted up a nation and inspired presidents who followed. One is the man I served as Secretary of State, Barack Obama, and another is my husband, Bill Clinton” (Clinton, 2015). Additionally, her 2008 announcement was focused on the issues and herself, while in her 2016 announcement, she mentioned not only Franklin Roosevelt
and Bill Clinton, but the popular President she is trying to replace, Barack Obama. Hillary Clinton uses references Barack Obama and her husband to bolster her credibility because of how much of a polarizing figure she has always been. This was an example of Clinton using masculine rhetoric because she cited popular Democrat Presidents’ and used their credibility to seem Presidential herself. This was a nod to logic making it masculine political rhetoric because by her linking herself with two popular Democrat President’s she herself will have gain some credibility by association. Those two male figures in the Democratic Party are very popular and the last two men to win the White House as Democrats and serve two terms at the time. Secretary Clinton not only spoke about her association with these men, but she also strategically sent them to campaign for her throughout the primary and general election.

From The Waltz to The Quick Step

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, as a female Presidential candidate, had to balance a lot rhetorically speaking. She had to maintain her femininity while demonstrating that she could handle confrontations with other world leaders and Presidential candidates. As earlier explained by Dr. Katz, the Presidency was inherently a male-dominated institution and made white male candidates essential to how the Presidency is supposed to be perceived. The candidates in the primary and general elections are fighting to be viewed as the most dominant and masculine man to the electorate is a huge part of the process (Katz, 2016) that candidates such as former Secretary of State Clinton cannot fully embrace without looking inauthentic. Former of State Hillary Clinton, being a woman, could not rely upon the white patriarchal philosophy to attract voters. Just like President Barack Obama, if she wanted to win, she could
not to alienate big parts of the electorate, especially white men. This rhetorical balancing was accomplished by Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, allowing her to become a viable female candidate for the presidency. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton employed masculine style clothing such as pants suits in comparison to the republican vice-presidential nominee in the 2008 race Governor Sarah Palin, who then displayed hyperfeminized professional clothing that accentuated her female figure and looks to attract the electorate. Secretary Clinton also effectively showed various traits that are essential to winning the Presidency in her debates against her opponents that made the other candidates look weak. Secretary Clinton used hyperfeminine rhetoric to overpower her opponents by taking control of the debates and to speak on issues important to her. Comparatively, she was able to show a softer feminine side to her political persona during regular campaign rallies by having more laid-back stump speeches and the use of personal stories on the campaign trail.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is very notably famous for her use of pantsuits on the campaign trail and in her professional life. An article from CNBC explains the reason for Clinton’s use of pants suits in her own words from her memoir of the 2016 election, What Happened. The article reports that “Clinton says…[a]…benefit to having a uniform is finding an easy way to fit in with the rest of the guys. “I also thought it would be good to do what male politicians do and wear more or less the same thing every day,” Clinton writes. She writes that “as a woman running for President,” she liked the “visual cue” that she was “different from the men but also familiar.”” (Mejia, 2017). The article continues by reporting that Clinton writes in her campaign memoir that “[it] was also an anti-distraction technique: since there wasn’t much to say or report on what I wore, maybe people would focus on what I was saying instead,” Clinton
writes.” (Mejia 2017). She decided to be taken more seriously as a politician and the years of harassment she was subjected to as First Lady to go with a more masculine-looking public persona. This allowed her to be viewed differently from women who choose to display their femininity more than Former Secretary of State Clinton Hillary allowed herself to during her time in the Senate, the Obama Administration, and both Presidential campaigns. Compared to Governor of Alaska Sarah Palin at the time of the 2008 election, researcher at Northwestern found that men tend to vote for female candidates who are viewed as more attractive (Felchner, 2008). This article does not say if the study includes female candidates at the top of the ticket. The difference between former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and former Governor of Alaska Sarah Palin was how they wanted to be perceived by the electorate. The thought at the time of a woman being at the top of a major national party ticket other than former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was unthinkable due to her popularity among Democrats, even though she was a polarizing figure. Governor of Alaska Sarah Palin, in 2008, never was able to look presidential in the same way Hillary Clinton because on how society views women in politics. American society treats woman differently than men and politics was normally seen as job men participate in compared to the role women usually play as compliant supporting spouse. The loss of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in the Presidential race in 2008 and a black man running for President on the Democratic ticket meant for the GOP ticket picking a woman to be nominated for Vice-President would add diversity to the GOP Presidential tick but had they ability to be more accepted because she was not on the top of the ticket. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was able to be viewed the same as a man when it came to the male dominant space of presidential politics in society. Governor of Alaska Sarah Palin, on the other hand, needed Senior Senator of Arizona John McCain to legitmatize her ability to be seen as potential Vice-President.
because she was not able to be held in the same regard as former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Former Secretary of State Clinton routinely continued to show off her ability to go toe-to-toe with other male politicians during her time in the campaign debates, where the perception of her being tough on stage was personified. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, during debates, interrupted her opponents, stayed on message, and even was able to steer the discussion of the topic given by the moderator successfully to talk about the issues she wanted to discuss. Although former Secretary of State Clinton always seems to show her hypermasculine side during Presidential debates, her visual messages of toughness seem to be less effective in debating one on one as seen during her early primary debates in 2008 and 2016 compared to later on when she had only one opponent. Her opponents seemed to be in better positions to counteract her aggressive rhetorical arguments with as equally aggressive arguments or, as in the case of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Presidential debate in 2016 with Businessman Donald Trump, the visual size difference between the two of them. Businessman Donald Trump continually followed former Secretary of State Clinton around the debate stage while she was answering audience invading her personal space. Mr. Trump through the television seemed to tower over former Secretary of State Clinton making her look small and using an argumentative aggressive tone he made her look weak. Former Secretary of State Clinton’s persona was not as strong as it was in the first and last debates in 2016 comparatively to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} town hall debate format. This is how Mr. Trump, a hypermasculine candidate, used his own visual cues to make Hillary look feminine and weak, which was his part of his argument against her all the campaign. By making former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton look like she was vulnerable by following her around the
debate area not only making her uncomfortable throwing her off he game but let the audience visualize the size and height difference between the two candidates that was not clearly shown during the first and third debates. Since they were held on a stage with the candidates using of podiums, they proportionally looked the same. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s ability to look tough and masculine in the public eye is carefully scripted by her and her team, because it is necessary for her to be taken more seriously by the average female politician. There are obvious biological difference between men and women sizes that make men seem tougher and more menacing because they are usually bigger. Politics is a men social club and in order for former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to be not only taken seriously by the politician themselves, but the public is to show traditional masculine tendencies.

An example of former Secretary of State Clinton using her aggressive rhetoric to show strength in comparison to other males are the Democratic Primary debate held in New Hampshire on June 3, 2007, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton still, during this time in the Democrat Primary, was the odds-on favorite to win the nomination, and there were many Democratic candidates still running at the time. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, within this debate, not only defended herself from attacks from other candidates successfully and turn them positive, but she was also able to make jokes or poke fun at other candidates at times. Clinton was asked during this debate how she would use her husband, former President Bill Clinton, to throw her off, and the question was asked by President Barack Obama at the time in a joking manner. Clinton skillfully replied, “when I become president, Bill Clinton, my dear husband, will be one of the people who will be sent around the world as a roving ambassador to make it very clear to the rest of the world that we're back to a policy of reaching out and working
and trying to make friends and allies and stopping the alienation of the rest of the world” (Clinton, 2007). Turning the question into a positive for herself. During this debate, it was not the first-time opponents brought her husband up in the debate to score political points. This was also a skillful use of masculine rhetoric by answering a question with a command. Gays serving openly in the military was a hotly contested issue in the Democratic Party and an issue President George W. Bush made prominent in the 2004 election against Senior Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts. When attacked for her husband’s decision to sign the “don’t ask don’t tell” legislation, Clinton again spins it to her advantage and defends the positions she took during the campaign to allow for gays to serve openly in the military. Clinton said, “It was a transition policy, and it was an effort to try to deal with the reality that probably since the very beginning of our nation we've had gays serving in our military with distinction and honor on behalf of our country, as we do today. And yet I have watched how "don't ask, don't tell" has been implemented, and I've concluded that it is not the best way for us as a nation to proceed.” (Clinton 2007). She later stated that “the Congress was adamantly opposed at the time to letting gays and lesbians serve openly. "Don't ask, don't tell" was the compromised policy” (Clinton 2007).

Former Secretary of State Clinton in these early campaign debates in both 2008 and 2016, seemed like the strongest democratic candidate, but when she came down to a singular opponent, it was harder for her persona to be as effective. In 2016 Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump participated in 3 Presidential Debates. Many people in the electorate agree that Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton won the first and last debate based on her rhetoric and visual appearance. Former Secretary of State Clinton used keywords used by President Obama in his
presidential campaigns such as “trick down” (Obama, 2008; Clinton, 2016). In the 1st debate, former Secretary of State Clinton says, “trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn’t worked. And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class” (Clinton, 2016). Former Secretary of State Clinton also made a policy statement about taxes specifically comparing her and Businessman Donald Trump. She said “The fact is, he is going to advocate for the largest tax cuts we’ve ever seen. Three times more than the tax cuts under the Bush administration. I have said repeatedly throughout this campaign, I will not raise taxes on anyone making $250,000 or less” (Clinton, 2016). Her argument invoked President Obama’s policies and tried to appeal to voters who have supported him in the past. President Obama repeated in 2008 in the general election against Senior Senator John McCain of Arizona compared his tax plan to his claiming he would give a tax cut to individuals making less than $250,000 and while making the case for his tax plan called republican tax policies “trickle-down economics” (Obama, 2008). This is an example of Hillary Clinton ability to switch up rhetorical gender norms to her benefit.

**Hillary and Learning the Mambo**

Secretary Clinton was not the same candidate running in the 2016 Presidential race as in the 2008 race. She was not a different candidate, but the country as a whole was in a different place when she originally ran in 2008. Many of her ideas were the same, but the way she was presented them to the American people was different, making many people feel she was not very
authentic (Nyhan, 2015). The divide that started in the race between her and then then-Senator Obama became more apparent in both races in 2016. These races became more and more about identity politics and less about actual policy (Denton Jr., 2010; Balz, 2018). Former Secretary of State Clinton’s feminist ideals and progressive viewpoints of her compared to other female politicians culminated in the general election against the hypermasculine Businessman Donald Trump. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton being a politician who is a woman and the public already negative perception of her being inauthentic made Businessman Donald Trump’s hypermasculine “in your face” persona made his argument attractive to parts of the electorate.

Former Secretary of State Clinton, before facing off against Businessman Donald Trump, ran a tight primary race against Senior Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont. This, too many in the Democratic Party, was a surprisingly tight race, but this should not have surprised those in the larger political sphere. President Barack Obama was largely a political novice and new to the national stage not only to become a viable candidate, but he was also able to win both primary and general elections. Former Secretary of State Clinton, in both races, represented the establishment wing of the party. She had become a staple in the Democratic Party for so long that voters already had an opinion about her before she could make an argument for herself. Former Secretary of State Clinton was a stand barer in her own right due to her own work as First Lady and Senator for women and children’s rights and did not need to appeal to the electorate the same way President Barack Obama did. President Obama and former Secretary of State Clinton’s signature issues are different and since former Secretary of State Clinton has been in the public eye for years if she decided to recreate President Barack Obama’s coalition it could be seen as more of her changing her in order for her to gain power. Senior Senator of Vermont
Bernie Sanders arguably took up where President Barack Obama was in 2008 and went further left regarding policy ideas. Former Secretary of State Clinton was a moderate democratic and, even in 2008, was to the right of Barack Obama on several key issues (Clinton, 2008). President Obama, during his tenure as President, became and ushered in more liberal progressive policies. Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont only caucuses with Democrats in the Senate, but he is considered an independent socialist, and just like President Obama, young people broke for Senator Sanders of Vermont (Pinto, 2016). Because former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton already had baggage, Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont offered something new to the table which excited certain parts of the electorate. This division was made worse by news outlets coming out that they had evidence that the DNC was “rigged” so former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton would win the primary and for Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont to lose (Shear and Rosenberg, 2016).

Former Secretary of State Clinton was attacked during the Presidential campaign for other people’s actions in the race that derailed her campaign. One of the big controversies of the election was the WikiLeaks publishing of emails from the DNC that some argued proved that the DNC was actively trying to help Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton win the nomination and stop Senior Senator of Vermont Bernie Sanders from winning it (Sanders, 2016). Some of Senior Senator Bernie Sanders’ voters, 1 out of every 10, voted for Donald Trump, which could have ended up costing her the election (Kurtzleben, 2017). Some of Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont voters also did not like Barack Obama as President and also felt that “whites did not have advantages” (Kurtzleben, 2017). Former Secretary of State Clinton winning the Presidency was viewed as a direct threat to their way of thinking. Those very same voters who did not like
President Barack Obama also did not like former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton because of racial and gender power narratives in America. President Barack Obama was black, and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was a woman and before that, the 2008 Presidential election, all Presidents before that, for the most part, were older white men, which Senior Senator of Vermont Bernie Sanders was. Many of those voters could not see past her femininity and their own privileged social identity even though their preferred political ideas were more aligned with former Secretary of State Clinton. Senior Senator of Vermont Sanders himself did not help the situation as well. The need to bridge the divide between him and former Secretary of Vermont Clinton did not go as fast as some in the Democratic Party wanted it too. This led to some tension because even though Senior Senator of Vermont Sanders campaigned for former Secretary of State Clinton in the General Election, many democratic voters felt that the nomination was stolen and felt that Sen. Sanders would not have been defeated by Businessman Donald Trump (Sanders, 2016).

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton won the primary election making her the Democratic nominee in 2016. She then went on to run against Mr. Donald Trump, who was starkly different from her and her views. Mr. Donald Trump used demagogic language to create support for his campaign. His campaign slogan “Make America Great Again” (Trump, 2016) ended up becoming a primary example of language he used to pit the electorate against one another. Former Secretary of State Clinton countered that messaging with her own campaign slogan, which was “Stronger Together”. During her acceptance speech, Clinton echoed themes she has had since her 2008 Presidential bid. An example of this is when she said, “Our Founders embraced the enduring truth that we are stronger together. America is once again at a moment of
reckoning. Powerful forces are threatening to pull us apart. Bonds of trust and respect are fraying. And just as with our founders, there are no guarantees. It truly is up to us” (Clinton, 2016). Former Secretary of State Clinton has always been for inclusive, progressive approaches, and she framed her campaign around it. The speech she wrote to concede to Trump was a message of hope for the future talking to her support who were let down as a result of President Trump election over her. For the entire 2016 race she wanted to be seen as an alternative than the Republicans and Mr. Donald Trump were offering the American people. Former Secretary of State Clinton even in defeat decided to address Mr. Trump’s demagogic tactics that got him elected in her concession speech and said,

“We have to decide whether we all will work together so we all can rise together. Our country’s motto is e pluribus unum: out of many, we are one. Will we stay true to that motto? Well, we heard Donald Trump’s answer last week at his convention. He wants to divide us - from the rest of the world, and from each other. He’s betting that the perils of today’s world will blind us to its unlimited promise (Clinton, 2016).

Former Secretary of State Clinton was arguably more feminine in her approach in her 2008 Presidential run than in her 2016 run and became more hyperfeminine during her second. She adapted her rhetorical strategy based on her opponent. Former Secretary of State Clinton became less personal and more business-like in the second run for President. An example is how she chose to start her 2008 campaign and her 2016 one. Former Secretary of State Clinton’s 2008 announcement video was personal, in her home, and she stated she wanted to have a conversation with the American people. While in 2016, she chose a less personal, more traditional professional way to announce her candidacy like other politicians. The intimate view
of her homelife and the choice of launching it on the internet instead of having a campaign is two 
examples. Choices like this made the campaign feel different than her original 2008 run, making 
it harder for voters to connect to her. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton did face two 
different opponents in, President Barack Obama and Businessman Donald Trump from the 
beginning, Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was a very dominating figure.

Failing to Dance and Singing the Blues

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, on November 9, 2016, the day she conceded, 
said, “I feel pride and gratitude for this wonderful campaign that we built together, this vast, 
diverse, creative, unruly, energized campaign. You represent the best of America and being your 
candidate has been one of the greatest honors of my life” (Clinton, 2016). She understood the 
symbolic “first” nature of her campaign in the context of history even though she lost and a 
campaign that was in line with her values such as diversity, inclusion, and feminism. She 
understood that she was the first woman to be nominated for President by a major party and said, 

“This loss hurts, but please never stop believing that fighting for what's right is worth it. 
[applause]It is — it is worth it. [applause]And so we need — we need you to keep up these 
fights now and for the rest of your lives. And to all the women, and especially the young women, 
who put their faith in this campaign and in me, I want you to know that nothing has made me 
prouder than to be your champion” (Clinton, 2016).

A cornerstone of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s values has always been 
advancing women’s rights, and even in defeat, she found it important to mention it because she
did not see herself as the last. Finally, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, always being a fighter, did not make a traditional concession speech but made statements to the electorate about how to stop now President-Elect Donald Trump from having a second term. She reminds voters who were disappointed in her loss that,

“…our constitutional democracy demands our participation, not just every four years but all the time. So let's do all we can to keep advancing the causes and values we all hold dear; making our economy work for everyone, not just those at the top, protecting our country and protecting our planet, and breaking down all the barriers that hold any American back from achieving their dreams” (Clinton, 2016).

Former Secretary of State Clinton even as she was ending her Presidential campaign in she continued to used hyperfeminine political rhetoric to rally progressive voters against President-Elect Donald Trump. As a normal citizen and was not longer in the game but left the mantle for someone to pick up. She asked for help from the people who have the same dreams and values to her that even though she lost, the path forward was not lost. Former Secretary of State Clinton laid the foundation for women running for President a script to analysis on how to achieve what she cannot because technically she won in the popular vote. The system put in place by those with unequitable ideologies stopped her, so her way does work and it is only a matter of time until hyperfeminine will have a chance to lead in America like other countries.
Chapter 6: Dancing Takes Partners but Star Quality to Join

Businessman Trump rose to prominence during the 2016 Presidential election. He brought with him the anger of the people who felt left behind during the Obama years. Mr. Trump was the answer to their problems. A man who said what he felt and did what he wanted compared to President Obama and his General Election opponent former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Businessman Trump’s authenticity is what drew his supporters to him; Trump was a different option from normal politicians, and the public saw someone who always did not engage in the politically correct action. A Donald Trump presidency is not what the majority of the public wanted but it is the President they got. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton won 3 million more votes than Mr. Donald Trump in the General Election but because of how the US election system works it did not matter and only the polarity of votes in each state matter, which Trump won barely. When it came down to the messages produced by each candidate, Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton won the argument but lost the Presidency. Too many people were apathetic about her campaign because they were either too angry about how she got there or how they felt about her as a person. Conservatives felt this was a win for them by winning the White House but with an inexperienced President politically there, who does not listen to people who has been in politics longer than him. Mr. Trump relied on his instincts to make the decisions that will kept him popular with his base and moved his agenda forward. Mr. Trump was a businessman and as a businessman is used to having complete power in the organization he works with. Those who are concerned with the state of the economy supported him because as a
businessman he would have first had experience dealing with the government from the other side. He also had foreign policy experience from dealing with companies from other countries and understanding their interests. Businessman Trump like Obama was a different option to explore. President Trump suffered the same fate as President Obama by having the House of Representatives be taken over by the other party during the middle of his one-term. The difference between what happened to President Obama and President Trump was the outcome of their reelection campaign. Both President Obama and President Trump were very vulnerable incumbents that could be defeated. President Obama was able to beat former Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney back in 2012 because he was charismatic and likeable compared to Romney. Mr. Trump, on the other hand, is not likeable making it easier for his 2016 and 2020 opponent former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Vice-President Joe Biden to receive votes. Joe Biden had high approval rating during his time as Vice-President and he had a long-standing relationship with both Democrats and Republicans. Vice-President Joe Biden did not have to outdo Mr. Donald Trump, but he just had let Businessman Donald Trump be himself and let him destroy himself. Instead of a reverse Paso Doble and actual Paso Doble. After 4 years of the change the Mr. Donald Trump was promising it was a choice election like 2012 where to take the country. The Democratic party wanted to choose the person who had the best chance of beating President Trump and still continue progression but not create the backlash President Obama did by going too fast.

Vice-President Joe Biden and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was not the only option to run against Trump in 2020 or 2016 Presidential election. Many felt that Senior Senator of Vermont Bernie Sanders had a better chance in 2016 (Kurtzleben, 2017) to go against
President Trump and winning instead of Clinton. Reasons for a Senior Senator of Vermont Bernie Sanders would have had an easier time in 2016 than former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is lack of time in national politics and Senior Senator of Vermont Sanders being a man instead of a woman like former Secretary of State Clinton. Senior Senator of Vermont Bernie Sanders would have had an easier time beating Mr. Trump in 2020 than 2016 because a majority of American people were looking for someone to replace Trump and bring back some stability (Santhanam, 2019). A Bernie Sanders Presidency would have brought about systematic changes to how the government and economy works as President Obama did from 2009-2011. This would have continued the discourse occurring making the conservative side of the country become uncomfortable and Senior Senator Sanders of Vermont would have brought about change too quickly for this group of constituents. His Presidency would have been the same as President Obama’s. Vermont is a very liberal state, and it is different from the country as a whole. Senior Senator Sanders lacks the experience dealing with the GOP that he would need to win over to be able to move his agenda forward if he was elected to the Presidency (Thursh, 2019). He was in the Senate longer than President Obama was but just like Obama he did not have any real noticeable accomplishments in the United States Senate even though he was there longer (Thursh, 2019). This is the same for former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during her tenure in politics (Politico, 2015). Although former Secretary of State Hillary did serve more as an advisor to her husband, when he was President, and became the model for the modern American first Lady, she was a symbol of progression and not of actual substance due to lack of actually passed legislation and policy wins because it was not her job.
President Obama was rebuked by the American people. The number of votes that separate his respected opponents he defeated continually shrinks in each election. President Barack Obama: There was considerable amount of pushback during either during Obama Presidency, and during the 2016 election. This all started from Obama became President. This was a shock to the people system regardless of if the voted for him or not. President Obama did not look like a normal person who should be President and he was trying to bring progressive changed to the United States. President Obama continually got push back from not only his political adversaries but from his own party. Especially during the Healthcare Care debate that he spent all of his political capital on. President Obama spending his political capital on healthcare that was the main reason for the creation of the Tea Party and allowed for the hate/comfortability of the Obama Presidency for them. The plan that passed the supermajority Democratic controlled Congress and signed by a liberal Democratic President was a plan that was a replica of the statewide healthcare bill that was already in Massachusetts. This shows President Obama’s weakness. Because of President Obama’s weakness, he was not the right President for the time and paved away for discourse that he was not ready to handle. One of Obama mandates was created because of being the first black President was to handle the issue of race in America. He never acted on his instincts until he was backed into a corner. This is probably because President Obama grew up as mixed child and grow up with a white family (Obama, 1995). President Obama was not equipped to handle the problems going on during 2008-2016. The issues plaguing former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton campaign was not going on in 2008 and with the experience she had could tackle both the immediate issues such as the economy but other social issues like woman rights that she has always championed. President Obama by putting her in the cabinet was smart because she knows what she is doing but put a target on her back
because she was already looked upon as an opportunist. She also did not help herself by leaving right after the 1st term was done to get ready to run for President in 2016. It made the electorate feel that is why she resigned her post, which is actually why she did it. However, if she did not it would not have given her the time she needed to rest and get organized for the 2016 Presidential Election knowing it was going to be harder to get elected with President Obama in office because the job she needed to do. Secretary Clinton not only needed to defended herself against attacks from the past 20 years as public servant, she had to answer questions about her husband, make a case she is the right person to the lead the country after progressive polices was not what American people wanted, and defend the 8 years of President of Obama as a successful Presidency even though he really only got 3 very big pieces of legislation done in the first two years.

President Obama was elected to the White House with the promise of hope and change. His lack of experience made producing this change a challenge because he did not know how Washington worked well enough to know how to control narratives and cut deals. An example of an attempt to show leadership that was abysmal was his first attempt to negotiate with the GOP minority to show he was serious about by bipartisanship was drafting a bill that the Republicans in Congress would like during the creation of the “Stimulus Package”. The President proposed a bill that he though the GOP would be able to get on board with but when it came time to negotiate the GOP members wanted to change it and ask for more concessions (Divide States of America 2020). This would have not happened if the President started from a position of strength and not keep everything he wants in the original plan. This was not a show of leadership and the Democrats had to come and bail him out by voting on party lines, so the President can at least
show he was able to pass a bill. This remind constant throughout the Obama Presidency with his Vice-President Joe Biden being his greatest asset when needing to deal with Congress, when President Obama efforts have failed.

President Obama inability to bridge the divided between blacks and the rest of the country allowed for the alt-right to rise and Mr. Donald Trump to become President. The President by never talking about the issues of race personally and tackling these sensitive issue allowed other people to put their opinions in the marketplace of ideas. Without a voice like President Obama who carried weight with one option loud enough for everyone in the US to hear there was not any other option to choose from. President Obama kept explaining “he is the President of the United States of America” but he never wanted to take on this issue. Even though every time the President took the issue head on, he became a more viable candidate for the Presidency because he it made it look he had the capability to tackle this hard of an issue. The President giving the cryptic message to his supporters is not enough to create change. President Obama needed to have been more upfront and confrontational would have been the most effective way of dealing with the issue. President Obama had the answer being both black and raised by his White family members would be able to see both sides of the issue. The President missed out on an opportunity that could have defined his Presidency and allowed this issue to be taken up by other people. President Obama was scared to alienate his White supporters, so it politically made sense what he was doing but he came to Washington to change the status quo and he allowed this issue to get worse and worse when he was the prefect President to fix it. By the time a candidate Trump jumped into the race he already had been using a racist lens to form messages to divided people even the President himself. An example of this
would he the ongoing feud between the two men over if Obama was born in the US or not, which Obama relented and showed. This was the start of Trump winning and he the beginning of his control of pockets of the GOP base.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, so happened to be the Democratic nominee in 2016 and had controversies surrounding her winning the nomination and getting information for the second Presidential debate before her General election candidate. Although, the Secretary may be a victim of happen stance, she must also take blame in the rise of Trump. Former Secretary of State Clinton was a weak candidate for the Presidency and had too many unknowns. Former Secretary of State Clinton was a woman first and foremost. Out of everything this was her biggest downfall. Female politicians are looked differently and scrutinized harder than their male counterparts. Former Secretary of State Clinton had to balance needing to have show graceful feminine traits to show how she is a traditional cis female but have masculine traits becoming of a politician.

Former Secretary of State Clinton had also over twenty years of experience in politics either in elected or ceremonial positions. Former Secretary of State Clinton had a lot of baggage over the years, she has been a political figure that was easy for Businessman Donald Trump to securitize. This also included defending her husband former President Bill Clinton time in office and good and bad parts of his time in office. Former Secretary of State Clinton not being able to point to pieces of legislations during her time as an elected official that she had help craft and pass. Former Secretary of State Clinton did not have a lot of major policy wins during her time in public eye and was more of a symbol of women rights. Former Secretary of State Clinton touted her experience in both the 2008 and 2016 but that was her only message to her supporters other
than Trump was a horrible person. Former Secretary of State Clinton argument to be President was no on the job training. She allowed her ideas and time in public life to promote her. Mr. Donald Trump on the mainstream media with controversy providing free marketing for his campaign.

Finally, former Secretary of State Clinton not only needed to defend hers record and deal with of being a woman in politics, but she needed to defend the eight years of Obama Presidency. Former Secretary of State Clinton was running in a year where her party already controlled the White House for eight years prior to 2016. A part of former Secretary of State Clinton argument to have a chance to run to be elected President had to include what the last person in her party did and how it changed the voters lives for the better. Due to the lack of policy and legislative wins the Obama Presidency lacked after the supermajorities in the House and Senate where lost made that framing a winning argument to the American people hard for the Clinton campaign, while juggling former Secretary of State Clinton’s own flawed political candidacy.

The Obama Presidency and the societal image of a flawed candidacy of Hillary Clinton were the reasons for the rise of Donald Trump and the conservative wave the swept him into office in 2016 and the gradual takeover of Congress from a Democratic supermajority starting in the midterm elections in 2010. President Obama lack of experience in Washington led him to not have the skills necessary to overcome the opposition of the GOP during his Presidency. President Obama was likeable and had idea’s that he convinced voters in 2008 his vision of America was the necessary steps forward for progressive but also was elected to deal with other issues such as race in America that he avoided during most of Presidency until he could not. President Barack
Obama charisma was unmatched between all of his opponents in both 2008 and 2016 that propelled to Presidency but did not have the understanding of the system to get what he wanted done and learn the ability to strike deals across the political spectrum effectively. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, on the other hand, was the ultimate Washington insider. Being in the political spotlight for so long and being in both ceremonial and elected position gave her way more experience than President Barack Obama. This meant she had a deep understanding on how Washington work and the argument can be made she could have potentially been more of an effective Head of State when it came to policy achievements compared to President Obama.

However, she run in a year that the Democratic candidate running for President would be in weaker position than normal because she is from the incumbent party. Secretary of State Clinton also had no major policy wins from her time as First Lady, a Senator from New York, or Secretary of State under Obama during his first term. Former Secretary of State Clinton opened herself to attacks on effectiveness and the argument was made by Mr. Trump that she is not and effective politician regardless of her experiences in Washington.

Mr. Trump was able to benefit from the discourse that happen during the Obama years and the herculean task former Secretary of State Clinton had in 2016 to win the Presidency. The rise of the conservative movement started when President Obama started to systemically change how the government interactive in the American people’s lives. The GOP took over the framing of how Obama Presidency looked and what he was trying to do by repeatedly not taken advantage of Obama’s lack of experience in Washington. President Obama inability to negotiate and sell his vision to the American and to compromise was unable to deliver on many campaigns promise causing an opening for Republicans in Congress to put out a message to the American
people that was made to change their minds about President Obama. It ended up working because President Obama did not understand how to govern and understand that his idea’s need to be constantly repeated to the population to compete with the other idea in the marketplace of ideas. Former Governor of Massachusetts Mitt Romney should have beaten President Obama because of how vulnerable he was a candidate in 2012 but President Obama was more charismatic than former Governor of Massachusetts Romney. Due to former Governor of Massachusetts Romney inability to be charismatic and draw people in he lost to President Obama but not by a huge margin in the Popular vote.

Mr. Trump, although unlikeable candidate was very magnetic and charismatic compared to his Primary opponents and his general election opponent. Businessman Trump used former Secretary of State Clinton flaws against her every chance he got to keep remind the voters and talk less about his flaws. He skillfully took over the airwaves by producing news for the sake of producing news that voters could continue be overwhelmed by news that included him, keeping former Secretary of State Clinton message from being heard. Businessman Trump also benefited from being a man compared to former Secretary of State Clinton and his over hypermasculine message resonated with voters, who haven’t not caught up to the little bit of progress President Obama did in his first two years. What had over former Secretary of State Clinton that was his charisma over her. This made people want to listen to him regardless of if he was liked by the voter or not compared to former Secretary of State Clinton who people felt comparatively was less magnetic than Mr. Trump, making it easier to ignore her. Because she was easier to ignore Businessman Trump was able to dominant news media outlets sending his message out. Former Secretary of State Clinton arguable was the more magnetic and charismatic than the two of them.
She was able to win more votes than him throughout the country and when she wanted to be in the news could control the airwaves when she wanted taking the limelight away from President Trump. Being a woman she had deficit in Presidential politics due it being saturated with masculine and hypermasculine rhetoric.

The reason President Trump was able to be defeated by a bigger popularity in 2020 with history being on his side as an incumbent because former Vice-President Joe Biden did not have the same weakness as President Obama and Secretary Clinton. Vice-President Joe Biden could point to pieces of legislation and policy he was able to do during his time before running for President. He also may not have been has hated as former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, he did try to focus on being Businessman Trump in popularity contest. Vice-President Biden allowed Mr. Trump to convince the public why he should not be reelected and why Biden was better suited.

Finally, the type of rhetoric used between the three made all the difference in the makeup of their campaigns and how voters viewed them. Politics in general is saturated with masculine and hypermasculine rhetoric making President Obama and Former Secretary of State Clinton unique orators to look at because they choose different gender assigned political rhetoric. This made them different than the everyday politician. Mr. Trump even though was not a career politician used political rhetoric that is used during Presidential politics to gain dominance over the field of candidates. He was special because he won on a technicality. This proves that there is a space at the table for feminine and hyperfeminine political views in Presidential politics there is enough support in the general public for true change to happen. Vice-President Joe Biden both allowed President Donald Trump to be his own worst enemy, he fought President Donald Trump
using hypermasculine rhetoric allowing for the voters to be faced with an option easier for them to accept.

The elections in 2008, 2012, and 2016 were all examples of where the more charismatic candidate won, and 2008 and 2016 is where the candidate with less experience than the other won as well. Charisma will trump experience with the American people because the candidate with the most magnetic message will be listened to the most giving them more opportunity to convince voters of their argument. This should be a warning to those seeking the Presidency that the key to the Presidency is creating a persona liked by public and a creative message that is popular with masses: it is a difficult task to do.
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